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Name: Republic of Sudan (Dschumh_riyyat as-S_d_n)
Location: 15 00 N, 30 00 E, Northern Africa
Size: 2.5m sq km (966,757 sq miles)
Climate: North: arid desert and Sahel, rains from July to September, South: tropical rainforest, rainy season lasting from April to November
Currency: Sudanese Pound (SPG)
Population: 40,218,456 (est.)1
Capital: Khartoum
Languages: Arabic and English (official), Dinka and other local languages/dialects
Religions: Islam, Christian, Animism
Ethnic Groups: 52 % African, 39 % Arabs, 6 % Beja, and 3 % others2
Economy: petroleum; small reserves of iron ore, copper, chromium ore, gypsum, tungsten, mica, silver, gold, and hydropower
GDP: $62.2 billion (2008)3
Independence: 1 January 1956 (from Egypt and UK)
National Holiday: Independence Day, 1 January (1956)

Introduction

Sudan is geographically the largest country on the African continent and the tenth largest worldwide. The country remains starkly divided: by religion, ethnicity, economic resources, and educational opportunity.4 Principally it is composed of Arabs in the Islamic North and black Africans in the partly Christian and animistic South, creating a population of mixed ancestry and religion which has been a persistent locus of conflict for decades.5 Moreover, the relationship between the NORTH and the South has also constantly been characterized by a vast economic disparity. Following independence from British rule in 1956, the country went through a transitional period of so-called Sudanization (i.e. foreign government and military officials were replaced by citizens) – and experienced several political coups that further emphasized the geographic and social differences between the north and south. Drought, lack of resources, and the longest civil war in African history led to widespread famine and environmental problems, forcing large numbers of refugees to cross into neighbouring countries, coming with estimated two million people killed and four million displaced only over the last two decades. Another conflict that erupted in the western region of Darfur in 2003 has claimed more than 200,000 lives and left more than two million people displaced from their homes. A fragile peace was established with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between North and South in 2005.6 However, while some progress has been made
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1 Census in 2008 but reliability questionable
2 Index Mundi, 'Sudan Ethnic Groups'.
3 Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade, Government of Australia, Sudan Factsheet.
5 Sudan-info.de
during the last three years, the conflict in Darfur continues and implementation of the CPA has fallen behind schedule.

**Geography**

With an area of 2.5 million square kilometres (966,757 sq miles) Sudan is the largest country in Africa. Dominated by the Nile and its tributaries, it borders Egypt, Libya, Chad, the Central African Republic, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Uganda, Kenya, Ethiopia and Eritrea. Sudan has over 800km of coastline along its north-eastern border, providing access to the Red Sea.7

**Area - Comparative:** slightly more than one-quarter of the size of the USA; Southern Sudan equals the size of Germany

**Terrain:** generally flat, featureless plain; mountains in far south, northeast and west; desert dominates the north.

**Central Rivers:** Nile, Ghazal, Atbara

**Elevation Extremes:** lowest point: Red Sea 0 m, highest point: Kinyeti 3,187 m (located in the Immatong Mountains at the Southern borderline with Uganda).

**Climate:** Various vegetation zones ranging from an arid desert in the North to the tropical rainforest in the South. In summer, the North experiences temperatures as high as 50° C accompanied by sand storms (Habous) and only few short rain showers, whereas the South and Southwest is affected by the rainy season lasting from April to November.

**Natural Resources:** oil (esp. in Heglieg and Al-Wihda); small reserves of iron ore (western part of the country and in the east in the Red Sea Hills), copper, chromium ore (Liaicrn part), gypsum (vicinity of Khartoum and the Red Sea coast), tungsten, mica (Eastern parts of the Bayuda Desert), silver/gold (Ariab region in Eastern Sudan)8, and hydropower (biggest project is the Merowe Dam close to the village Hamdab)9

**Drilling:** The majority of oil reserves are located in the Muglad and Melut basins (South). Constant civil conflict limited the oil exploration mostly to the central and south-central regions of the country.10

**Mining:** At present only gold and chromite are mined and there are still further unexploited huge reserves of gold reserves occur in the eastern and northern parts of the country.

**Arable Areas:** Mostly located in the Nile valley, Sudan's agricultural sector is an important source of currency income through the export of crops like cotton, which is primarily cultivated in the Dschazira plain between the White and the Blue Nile rivers. Sudan supplies approximately 80 percent of the worldwide gum Arabic production (50% from Kordofan Province, 25% from Kassala Province and 25% from Darfur).

---

8 Embassy of the Republic of Sudan India, 'The Mining Sector'.
10 United States Department of Energy, ‘Sudan Energy Data: Statistics and Analysis.’
International agreements: Biodiversity\textsuperscript{11}, Climate Change\textsuperscript{12}, Desertification\textsuperscript{13}, Endangered Species\textsuperscript{14}, Law of the Sea\textsuperscript{15}, Nuclear Test Ban\textsuperscript{16}, Ozone Layer Protection\textsuperscript{17}

History

Ancient History

The history of Sudan goes back to the time of the Pharaohs. To the old Egyptian Empire, Nubia (part of Sudan) was an important source of gold and slaves. Around 2,000 B.C.E. Nubia was integrated into Egyptian territory. In the sixth century, Sudan (then the Nubian kingdoms Nobatia, Makuria, and Alodia) experienced its first encounter with Christian missionaries. However, after the establishment of Christian kingdoms and partially successful Christianization of the country, with exemption of the South, Sudan was slowly Islamized between the 14th and 16th centuries. Modern relations between Sudan and Egypt began in 1820, when an Egyptian army under Ottoman command invaded Sudan.\textsuperscript{18} The subsequent sixty-four-year period of Egyptian rule left a deep mark on Sudan's political and economic systems.

Colonial History

The first successful uprising of an African country against colonial rule took place in Sudan with the Mahdi-Rebellion which lasted 18 years (1881-1899). Under the Islamic-political leader Muhammad Ahmad, the self-declared Mahdi, the Sudanese people fought against the Egyptian occupation, resulting in the creation of an independent Sudanese state. The so-called Omdurman Caliphate existed for 15 years but was defeated by an Anglo-Egyptian Force in 1898. After this successful re-conquest of Sudan, a British-Egyptian Condominium was established in 1899. However, Sudan remained a de facto British colony until 1956.

Post-Colonial and Modern History

After the downfall of King Faruk of Egypt, Britain and Egypt signed an accord ending the condominium arrangement in 1953 and agreed to grant Sudan self government within three years. The agreement also provided for a senate for the Sudan, a Council of Ministers, and a House of Representatives, elections to which was to be supervised by an international commission. Elections in late 1953 resulted in victory for the National Umma Party (NUP), and its leader, Ismail al-Aihari, who became Sudan's first Prime Minister. On December 19, 1955, the Parliament voted unanimously that the Sudan should become "a fully

\textsuperscript{11} GEF Concept Paper: Sudan – Conservation of Biodiversity and Protected Area Management in Jebel Marra Nature Reserve.
\textsuperscript{12} United Nations Development Programme, ‘National Adaptation Programme of Action for Climate Change,’ Sudan.
\textsuperscript{13} United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, ‘Sudan,’ Country Information Data Base.
\textsuperscript{14} Wiser Earth, ‘Wildlife Conservation General Administration, Sudan.’
\textsuperscript{17} US Department of Energy, Sudan Profile.
\textsuperscript{18} Library of Congress, Country Studies: Sudan.
independent sovereign state*. British and Egyptian troops left the country on January 1, 1956, the same
day that a five-man Council of State was appointed to take over the powers of the governor general until
a new constitution was agreed.\textsuperscript{19} Following the declaration of independence, military and political coups
were a common event in Sudanese politics in this early period, undermining prospects for any sustainable
democratization process to take root. After a socialist turn in the late 1970s and early 1980s, Sudan came
under the rule of an Islamic government in the mid-1980s. Civil war, which had flared soon after
independence until the early 1970s between the North and South, once more erupted in the early 1980s
along the same fault-line.\textsuperscript{20} Due to increasing political instability stemming from the continuing turmoil, in
1989 General Omar al-Bashir led another military putsch which saw him installed as the country’s
President, a position he retains today. While the North-South conflict continued, a new crisis took shape in
Darfur in 2003. Although the violent North-South conflict was officially ended with the signing of the
Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005 between the Khartoum government and the Sudan People’s
Liberation Movement, the pursuit for remains for Sudan.\textsuperscript{21} The implementation of the CPA still faces many
hurdles before it is irreversibly secured and, of course, the tragedy that is Darfur endures today.

\textbf{Population}

\textbf{Demographics}

Although its reliability has been disputed widely, according to the official census conducted in 2008 Sudan
has an estimated population of 40,218,456\textsuperscript{22} with an annual growth rate of approximately 2%. With
respect to the age structure, 41 \% of the Sudanese people are younger than 15 and 56 \% between 15
and 64 years old which roughly equals a median age of 19. The life expectancy in Sudan ranges
depending on the sources between 50 (CIA Factbook) and 58 years (World Bank 2006), without major
disparities in expectancy between women and men.\textsuperscript{23}

\textbf{Ethnicity}

Sudan’s population is composed of 52 \% African, 39 \% Arabs, 6 \% Beja, and 3 \% others. In the North,
the largest commonly recognized ethnic groups are Arabs, Nubians, Beja, and Fur, and in the South the
Dinka, Nuer, Shilluk, and Nuba.\textsuperscript{24} Moreover, these ethnic groups subdivide themselves into further tribal
or other groups.

\textbf{Religion}

Islam is Sudan’s state religion. However, with respect to religious affiliation, 70\% of the Sudanese people
are Muslim, approximately 5\% Christian (mainly catholic) and 25\% animists. The non-Muslims mainly live
in Southern Sudan and in Khartoum. Since the end of the civil war, American-Protestant groups are
spreading in Southern Sudan.\textsuperscript{25} There are some Coptics in the North who mostly have their origins in
Egypt. Compared to other African countries, traditional religions, such as practiced by the Dinka, are still
particularly vital in Southern Sudan.

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{19} \textit{Sudan: A Historical Perspective}
\textsuperscript{20} \textit{Mongabay, Sudan: History.}
\textsuperscript{21} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{22} http://www.census.gov/ipc/www/idb/country/suportal.html
\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Central Intelligence Agency, World Fact Book, ‘Sudan.’}
Languages

Arabic and English are the official languages in Sudan. The Lingua franca Sudanese Arabic (an Arabian dialect) is predominantly spoken in northern and central Sudan. English is partly spoken as a second language in the North but the principal language in the South. Other major languages are Nubian and Ta Bedawie (Beja) in the North, Dinka and Nuer in the South, and Fur, Haussa, and Azande in the West.

Health

In general, the health status of the Sudanese population has suffered from both the prolonged civil war and the low quality of, and unequal access to health care. With a life expectancy at birth of 56 years and a disability-adjusted life expectancy of around 43 years, the health indicators are poor. Overall the health status indicators mirror the North–South differentials.26 Communicable, infectious and parasitic diseases such as tuberculosis, diarrhoea, malaria, measles and acute respiratory infections dominate the health status in Sudan and represent the main causes of morbidity and mortality.27 Nutrition is an area of major concern throughout Sudan despite relief assistance and food aid, which alone, totals 73% of all assistance provided. The government’s health system is reasonable in absolute numbers; however, all the available indicators on outputs show low productivity.28

Education

Generally, education does not make a crucial part of the national politics in Sudan, at least in terms of its share of GDP. Increases in expenditures on education have mostly been absorbed by salaries and not helped overcome the chronic lack of qualified teaching staff and education material.29 However, education levels in at least the North compare favourable with other African countries, with the University of Khartoum being of high reputation in Arabic academics.30 Over the last decades the number of post-secondary institutions has increased. Sudan has now 19 universities; the language of instruction is primarily Arabic.31 A positive trend is the high and constantly increasing ratio of female university students. Yet, it is noteworthy that the unemployment rate among university graduates in the field of their study is roughly 70%, a significantly high figure that contributes to the intellectual exodus the country is experiencing in recent years.32 Schools are mainly concentrated in urban areas, with many in the south and west destroyed or damaged by conflict.

Government

Government of National Unity (GNU)

27 Ibid.
28 Ibid.
32 Internationale Weiterbildung und Entwicklung gGmbH, Wirtschaft und Entwicklung Sudan.
The National Congress Party (NCP) and Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) formed a power-sharing government under the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA)\(^3\)

**Officials - North\(^4\)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President/ Prime Minister/ Commander in Chief</td>
<td>Lt. Gen. Omar Hassan Ahmed al-Bashir</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Vice President</td>
<td>Lt. Gen. Salva Kiir Mayardit</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Vice President</td>
<td>Ali Osman Muhamad Taha</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Foreign Affairs</td>
<td>Deng Alor Kuol</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Foreign Trade</td>
<td>James Kok Rona</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Investment</td>
<td>George Bioring Mayan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Cabinet Affairs</td>
<td>Kosti Manibe</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Education</td>
<td>Paul Mathianq</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Higher Education</td>
<td>George Boreing Niyami</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Roads and Transport</td>
<td>Philip Thon Leek</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Health</td>
<td>Tabitha Sokaya</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Humanitarian Affairs</td>
<td>Harun Run Lual</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Interior</td>
<td>Ibrahim Mahmoud Hamid</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Energy and Mining</td>
<td>Al-Zubayr Ahmad al-Hasan</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Defence</td>
<td>Abdel Rahim Mohammed Hussein</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Justice</td>
<td>Abdul-Basid Sabdarat</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Finance and National Economy</td>
<td>Dr. Awad Ahmad al-Jas</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Information</td>
<td>Zahawi Ibrahim Malek</td>
<td>Umma faction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of International Cooperation</td>
<td>Al-Tijani Saleh Hudeib</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Agriculture and Forestry</td>
<td>Prof. Zubeir Beshir Taha</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^3\) Ibid.

\(^4\) Gurtong Trust, Gurtong Peace Project: Sudan - Government of National Unity.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ministry</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Industry</td>
<td>Jalal al-Dugair</td>
<td>DUP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of International Cooperation</td>
<td>Al-Tigani Saleh Fedail</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Federal Government</td>
<td>Abdul-Rahman Sa’id Abdul Rahman</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of the Presidency</td>
<td>Bakri Hassan Saleh</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Parliamentary affairs</td>
<td>Joseph Okelo</td>
<td>USAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Animal Resources and Fisheries</td>
<td>Muhammad Ahmad at-Taher Abu Kalabis</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Culture, Youth and Sports</td>
<td>Mohammed Yusuf Abdallah</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Water Resources</td>
<td>Kamal Ali Mohammed</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Tourism</td>
<td>Josef Malwal</td>
<td>UDSF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Religious Affairs and Waqf</td>
<td>Azhari Al-Tigani Awad al-Sid</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Labour and Human Resources</td>
<td>Alison Manani Magaya</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Environment and Urban Development</td>
<td>Ahmed Babkir Nahar</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of Science and Technology</td>
<td>Prof. Ibrahim Ahmad Omar</td>
<td>NCP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minister of General Education</td>
<td>Hamid Mohamed Ibrahim</td>
<td>NDA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Officials – South**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Party</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President</td>
<td>H.E Lt. General Salva Kiir Mayardit (SPLM)</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-President</td>
<td>H.E Lt. General Dr. Riek Machar Teny-Dourghon</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Advisor</td>
<td>Mr. Lual Diing Wol (SPLM)</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security Advisor</td>
<td>Mr. John Kong Nyoun (SPLM)</td>
<td>SPLM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Government Structure**

The President of Sudan represents the highest executive authority. As the head of state and government he presides over the Council of Ministers, and stands as the commander in chief of the armed forces.\(^{36}\) The Presidency also includes a first vice president and a second vice president. First vice president is the person who has been elected to the post of President of Government of Southern Sudan. The legislative branch is embodied in the National Legislature (*al-majlis al-watani*), which consists of a lower house (The National Assembly) and an upper house (The Council of States). The 450 seats of the National Assembly are distributed according to a power sharing formula, allowing the ruling National Congress Party (*NCP* or *al-mutammer al-watani*) to hold 52% of the seats; the SPLM, 28%, and other northern and southern parties, 14% and 6% respectively. The Council of States is constituted by 52 representatives from the 26 Sudanese states (two per state) and additionally two observers from Abyei. The Sudanese Judicial branch is embodied in the High Court, Minister of Justice, Attorney General, and civil and special tribunals.\(^{37}\)

**Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS)**

According to the CPA, the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) leader will form the government of Southern Sudan and the government of the southern states, i.e. the Government of Southern Sudan and ten states, each of which will have an executive and a legislative assembly.

**Administrative subdivisions**

Twenty-six states, each with a governor appointed by the president, along with a state cabinet and a state legislative assembly.

---


\(^{37}\) [US Department of State, Bureau of African Affairs, Background Note: Sudan, November 2009.](#)
Political Parties

During three periods of civilian rule in the Sudan (1956-1958; 1964-1969 and 1986-1989), political parties proliferated. After the military takeover in June 1989 all political parties were banned, but registration opened up again in 1999 when a new law covering political parties (multi-party system) came into force. The main parties are:

- The National Congress Party, currently the ruling party, which has its roots in the Egypt in the 40's;
- The Umma Party, the political organization of the Islamic Ansar Sect. The party is led by Sadiq al-Sidiq Abdel Rahman al-Mahdi, who served as Prime Minister in all coalition governments between 1986 and 1989;
- The Democratic Unionist Party (DUP), based on the Khatmiyyah sect, led by Mohammed Osman al-Mirghani who is also the leader of the National Democratic Alliance, a loose coalition of political parties, labour unions and individuals who oppose the ruling party;
- The Popular National Party (PCP) which was created by Hassan al-Turabi in June 2000 after his expulsion from the National Congress Party.

In Southern Sudan, the Sudan People's Liberation Movement (SPLM) dominates. There are several parties representing the interests of Southern Sudanese in Northern Sudan. These include the Union of Sudan African Parties (USAP) and the United Democratic Salvation Front (UDSF).

There are a number of smaller religious, pan-Arabist and progressive parties, including the Communist Party of the Sudan, the Baath Party, the Republican Brothers and the Justice Party. Regional alliances include the National Redemption Front which is led by former governor of Darfur Ahmed Ibrahim Diragie, the United Sudan National Party, an amalgamation of parties representing the Nuba Mountains; and the Beja Congress which represents Eastern Sudan.

In May 2009, Northern opposition parties formed the National Alliance. The SPLM attended the conference as an observer, but did not officially join. The Alliance agreed to participate in elections if certain reforms were adopted by the NCP and pledged to run one candidate against President al-Bashir. The opposition called for the Government of National Unity (GNU) to be dissolved since elections were not held in July 2009, the date originally agreed upon in the CPA, and replaced by a larger and more inclusive caretaker government.

Political Situation

Peace and Security

Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement

For a long time the region of Eastern Sudan has been neglected politically and its population suffered from severe economic and social conditions, making it the least developed region in Sudan. This marginalisation has been the reason for continuous attacks from the rebels of the Eastern Front (Beja Congress and Free

---

Lions) against government targets since 1997. Although the rebels only carried out small-scale attacks, they feared the potential to develop into a major conflict. Consequently, in order to avoid an escalation, in August 2006, the Government of Eritrea convened negotiations between the Eastern Front (EF) and the Government of Sudan. The Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement (ESPA) was signed in Asmara (Eritrea) on 14 October 2006, aiming at greater development for Eastern Sudan.

**Darfur**

In 2003, while the historic North-South conflict was on its way to resolution, increasing reports began to surface of attacks on civilians in the extremely marginalized Darfur region of Sudan. A rebellion broke out in Darfur, led by two rebel groups--the Sudan Liberation Army (SLA) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) representing mostly "self-identified" African Muslim tribes. In seeking to defeat the rebel movements, the Government of Sudan increased arms and support to local African Muslims (Janjaweed). Attacks on the civilian population by the Janjaweed, often with the direct support of Government of Sudan Armed Forces (SAF), and the resulting large-scale displacements of people have led to the deaths of many thousands of people in Darfur and an estimated two million internally displaced people and another 250,000 refugees in neighbouring Chad.

Although several attempts have been made to create a Darfur Peace Agreement (DPA), under intense international pressure and support to solve the crisis got underway, all cease-fire agreements were continuously violated. The situation in Darfur has remained critical, since new conflicts erupted between those who signed the ceasefire agreement in 2006 and those who did not. The rebel movements separated into numerous new groups. Tensions between Sudan and Chad, which accuse one another of supporting rebel groups in other country respectively, add to the general devastating situation. Up to date the conflict has not come to an end, and significant improvements are not observable.

**Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA)**

There was hope for lasting peace in the country with the signing of a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the government and the SPLA in January, 2005. The CPA established a new Government of National Unity and the interim Government of Southern Sudan and called for wealth-sharing, power-sharing, and security arrangements between the two parties. The historic agreement provides for a ceasefire, withdrawal of troops from southern and eastern Sudan and the repatriation and resettlement of refugees. It also stipulates that by the end of the six-year interim period, during which the various provisions of the CPA are implemented, the South Sudanese will hold a referendum deciding on full independence of the South from the North. However, while some improvements have been observed during the last two years, significant implementation of central CPA provisions remains pending.

**The ICC Ruling**

On 14 July 2008, the Chief Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court (ICC), Luis Moreno-Ocampo, announced that he was seeking an arrest warrant for President Omar Hassan Ahmed al-Bashir for allegedly masterminding crimes against humanity in Darfur. The ICC followed up on the Chief Prosecutor’s

---

41 FCO, ‘Country Profile: Sudan’.
42 US Department of State, *Background Note: Sudan*.
43 Ibid.
44 http://www.auswaertiges-amt.de/diplo/de/Laenderinformationen/Sudan/Innenpolitik.html
45 US Department of State, *Background Note: Sudan*.
46 Ibid.
request by issuing an arrest warrant for al-Bashir on 4 March 2009, accusing him of orchestrating a five-year campaign of violence in Darfur.47

Media

Print:

- Al-Ra'y al-Amm - widely-distributed, privately-owned newspaper
- Al-Ayam - long-established newspaper
- Khartoum Monitor - privately-owned
- Al-Khartoum - privately-owned
- Al-Anbaa - government newspaper

Television:

- Sudan National Broadcasting Corporation (SNBC) - government-run, operates two channels, also available via satellite

Radio:

- Sudan National Radio Corporation - government-run, national and regional networks in Arabic, English and several other languages
- Voice of Sudan - operated by opposition National Democratic Alliance (NDA), broadcasts on short wave
- Voice of Hope - weekly broadcast by New Sudan Council of Churches, produced at studios in Uganda and the Netherlands and transmitted via Radio Netherlands relay station in Madagascar
- Voice of Freedom and Renewal - operated by armed opposition group Sudan Alliance Forces News agency

Internet: Internet services were introduced in 1997. There were some 300,000 internet users by 2003 (International Telecommunication Union source).48

The Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ) describes the press climate in Sudan as having deteriorated against a backdrop of insecurity, growing political unrest and protests over price rises.49 There is increasing censorship of opposition and independent newspapers in Sudan against the country's promise to the international community to adopt democratic reforms.50 Sudanese broadcasting is also highly restricted, with state-run radio and TV being under state control to reflect government policy. Internet use is increasing, with a ratio of 32.1 for every 1,000 people having internet access in 2004 from 0.9 in 2000.51

48 Information on Sudan.
50 Committee to Protect Journalists, ‘Sudanese Weekly Heavily Censored,’ Committee to Protect Journalists, 25 February 2009.
51 Committee to Protect Journalists, ‘Attacks on the Press in 2008: Sudan.’
Human Rights

According to the US Department of State, the signing of the CPA in 2005 has brought little improvement in human rights in the country. Attacks on civilians, killings, rape, torture, looting, arbitrary arrests and harassment of human-rights activists continue to be witnessed in Darfur and other parts of Sudan.52

Gender Issues

A number of constraints continue to challenge the implementation of women's rights, including patriarchal customs and continuous conflict between written law and customary/religious laws, according to the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM). In the ongoing Darfur crisis, women and girls remain vulnerable to sexual attacks in remote areas when they go out to fetch water or take their wares to the market,. Regarding the protection of women’s rights, Sudan has not ratified the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.53 Rape of women and girls throughout the country, including systematic rape in Darfur, continues to be a serious problem. The police arrested unmarried pregnant women who claimed to have been raped, unless the rape victim could provide proof of the crime. A woman cannot travel abroad without the permission of their husbands or male guardians. They must dress modestly according to Islamic standards, including wearing a head covering. In some instances police officers in the north and south arrested women for their dress. These cases have been well publicized in the Western media after Lubna Hussein, a journalist, working for UNMIS, was arrested for wearing trousers. She was originally sentenced to 40 lashes, but a judge later reduced her sentence to a 500 pound fine because of the bad press and protests the case generated. Hussein refused to pay and was imprisoned until colleagues paid the fine.54 Economic discrimination in access to employment, credit, and pay for substantially similar work, and owning or managing businesses is still a vital issue for women in Sudan.55

Economy

General Data:

Labour Force - by Occupation: agriculture 80%, industry and commerce 7%, government 13% (1998 est.)

Agriculture - Products: cotton, groundnuts (peanuts), sorghum, millet, wheat, gum Arabic, sugarcane, cassava (tapioca), mangos, papaya, bananas, sweet potatoes, sesame; sheep, livestock

Industries - oil, cotton ginning, textiles, cement, edible oils, sugar, soap distilling, shoes, petroleum refining, pharmaceuticals, armaments, automobile/light truck assembly

Main exports - Oil, petroleum, cotton, sesame, livestock and hides, gum

Monetary unit - Sudanese Pound (SPG)

GNI per capita - US $ 95056

Currency - 2.28 Sudanese pounds = 1 US dollar (12/03/2009)57

General Situation

Since the mid-1990s the Sudanese government has implemented several macroeconomic reform programs in cooperation with the International Monetary Fund (IMF) to modernize the economic infrastructure of the country. Privatization, liberalization and diversification have been core determinants of the reforms implemented, which mainly aim at balancing the various economic branches, macroeconomic stability and socio-economic growth incentives. The success of these reforms is reflected in the so-called “oil boom,” revived light industry and expanded export processing zones that helped sustain annual GDP growth rates of more than 10% in 2006 and 2007 as well as the decrease of the inflation rate down to 7% in 2006.58 Moreover, foreign direct investment has also been stimulated through changes in economic and financial laws. However, the central points of critique from both the IMF as well as the World Bank have been Khartoum’s military expenditures which roughly amount to 40% of the total budget and, in spite of the increasing revenues from oil exports, add to the rising external debt which exceeds the country’s financial capacities to fulfill its debt obligations.

Economic Disparity

The Southern but also Western areas of Sudan have not equally benefited from the economic growth of the past years. Especially, the crisis region of Darfur has experienced major slumps to its economy coming with the violent conflicts in 2003. Hence, in the aftermath of the 2005 CPA, the GoSS started to stimulate economic development on the basis of its two central revenue flows: (1) a 50% share of oil revenue from fields of Southern Sudan and (2) the Multi-donor Trust Fund. Investment priorities were education, health, infrastructure, and also increased government capacity.59 Southern Sudan has vast forest and mineral resources, great potential in livestock and forestry and almost 50 million hectares of prime agricultural land but economic activity remains at a subsistence level. It is estimated that less than 1% of land with agricultural potential is under cultivation, while at the same time food insecurity is chronic and widespread. Formal private sector capacity remains weak.

Economic and service delivery challenges will be compounded by the huge expected influx of IDPs and refugees.60 Further challenges are enormous, ranging from a severe lack of infrastructure, a lack of qualified human capital, an increasing regional insecurity, which, in turn, raises doubts over the prospects for a successful outcome of these attempts.

Trade

59 Understanding Sudan, South Sudan: Economic Development Possibilities, 12 July 2006.
The trade balance of Sudan has constantly been negative, although the rates of return from oil exports have significantly increased. In 2006 the balance deficit amounted to 5.1 billion US Dollar.\(^\text{61}\) Oil and petroleum products (accounting for more than 87% of the total export in 2006,\(^\text{62}\) gum Arabic, cotton, sesame, livestock, groundnuts and sugar represent the most important items of export of the Sudanese economy. With a 70 percent share of Sudanese oil exports, The People’s Republic of China (PRC) has made itself the most important export partner for Sudan. Besides China, also Japan and Saudi Arabia account for a large amount of imports of Sudanese products. At the same time, these countries are also among those nations (others are India, UAE, and Egypt) from where the Sudan imports foodstuffs, manufactured goods, refinery and transport equipments, medicines and chemicals.\(^\text{63}\)

**Sectors**

By employing 80 percent of the work force and contributing 32.9 percent (as compared to 31.2% for industry (mostly oil/petroleum) and 36% services) to the Gross Domestic Product, agriculture represents the most important economic sector of Sudan. Although the country is trying to diversify its cash crops, cotton, and gum Arabic remain its major agricultural exports. Despite the significance of the agricultural sector, Sudan remains a net importer of food. Problems of irrigation and transportation appear to be the greatest constraints to a more dynamic agricultural economy. Although Sudan is reputed to have great mineral resources, exploration has been quite limited, and the country’s real potential is unknown.\(^\text{64}\) It is foremost oil ("oil boom") that over the last five years has gained importance as a central engine behind the industrial development of the country. The current ratio of oil production is 457,000 bbl/day (2007 est.) with 360,000 bbl/day (2007 est.) being exported and 97,000 bbl/day (2007 est.) consumption.\(^\text{65}\)

**Infrastructure**

The country’s transport facilities consist of one 4,800-kilometer (2,748-mi.), single-track railroad with a feeder line, supplemented by limited river steamers, Sudan airways, and about 1,900 km. (1,200 mi.) of paved and gravel road—primarily in greater Khartoum, Port Sudan, and the north. Some north-south roads that serve the oil fields of central/south Sudan have been built; and a 1,400 km. (840 mi.) oil pipeline goes from the oil fields via the Nuba Mountains and Khartoum to the oil export terminal in Port Sudan on the Red Sea.\(^\text{66}\) The country has 51 airports (with the majority being paved and used for civilian purposes) and two central sea ports, Port Sudan and Port Suakin. Along the 4068 km of water roads, Dschuba, Khartum, Kusti, Malakal, Nimule and Wadi Halfa are major river ports of Sudan. As for hyper power generation, the Merowe Dam near the village Hamdab is the most ambitious recent project in Sudanese energy and infrastructural development.

**Development Indicators**

Sudan is one of the poorest nations in the world, and what wealth the country possesses is not widely distributed. Poverty is widespread, particularly in rural areas. Not surprisingly, Sudan is ranked number 150 out of 182 countries on the 2009 Human Development Index with an HDI value of only 0.531 (as
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\(^\text{62}\) International Trade Centre, Trade Performance Map.

\(^\text{63}\) Economy Watch, ‘Sudan Export and Import,’ Economy Watch.

\(^\text{64}\) US Department of State, Background Note: Sudan

\(^\text{65}\) Sudan Oil and Gas Report Q1 2009, January 2009.

\(^\text{66}\) http://jam.unsudan.info/drafts/reports/infra/Infrastructure-report-ch05.pdf
compared to e.g. Canada with 0.966 as value). About 90 percent of the Sudanese survives on less than $1 per day. Roughly 30% of the population has no or only little access to safe water, which affects overall sanitation and hygiene and encourages the spread of infectious diseases.

**Humanitarian Needs**

Sudan requires aid for the provision of protection and other humanitarian assistance for its citizens against widespread armed conflict in the Darfur region. Basically four types of humanitarian challenges need to be tackled: (1) influxes of war wounded following armed clashes, (2) epidemics (especially cholera and meningitis), (3) nutritional crises (both in the camps and in rural areas), and (4) large population displacements. With respect to the emergency response two basic problems remain, namely that the emergency alerts rarely come early and, second, access to the refugee camps is far from guaranteed. Moreover, there is inadequate funding to cope with the large refugee population from neighbouring countries, mainly Eritrea and Ethiopia, and thousands of Sudanese returnees.

**Children**

According to the World Bank, more than 40% of the Sudanese children between 0-5 years of age suffer from being underweight. The infant mortality rate is 86.98 per 1,000 live births. Primary and secondary school enrolment rates are around 38%. Education is free for children between the ages of six and 13, with the primary school enrolment ratio by percentage of 60.1. The country is home to 1.3 million orphans (0-17 years) according to the UN Children’s Fund. Child protection issues in Sudan include low birth weight, stunting, child labour and female genital cutting.

**Food Security**

The conflict in the south has left more than 1.5 million people dead and four million displaced. It has also wrecked the infrastructure and economy with food production being hampered by fighting and displacement, as well as by recurrent droughts according to the World Food Programme (WFP). At least 2.7 million people require food assistance in the greater Darfur region with the ongoing conflict expected to not only hit regional cereal production but also severely reduce food commodity flows from normally surplus-to-deficit areas. Sudan is categorised by the UN as a low-income, food-deficit country.

**Conflicts** Updated December 31, 2009
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71 Republic of the Sudan: Humanitarian Country Profile, IRIN News.
Introduction

The inter-related conflicts and peace processes in Sudan present a monumental peacekeeping challenge. The protracted crisis in Darfur has put the African Union and the broader international community to a severe test. Deploying a new hybrid African Union-United Nations operation has proven difficult and progress continues to be slow. Meanwhile, implementation of the north-south peace agreement is faltering, with the UN mission struggling to keep it on track. No peace operation can succeed unless underpinned by a viable political process. Implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement has suffered badly from a lack of inclusiveness. Essentially a bi-lateral agreement, it has failed to generate support locally. The north-south peace process, meanwhile, is struggling in part because the main parties have stopped engaging each other politically and neither especially the ruling elite in Khartoum is inclined to open political space for other actors or let the UN play a major role. While both sides remain broadly committed to the CPA, neither is fully prepared to give up the military option.  

NORTH-SOUTH WAR History

For all but 11 of the 52 years since its independence on 1 January 1956, Sudan has been engulfed in civil conflict and Sudanese leaders have been constantly engaged in suppressing uprisings in their western, eastern and southern peripheries. The North-South conflict between the Government of Sudan (GoS) and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A, which formally ended with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement on 9 January 2005, had its root causes in disputes over resources, power, the role of religion in the state and self-determination. The 21-year conflict devastated a significant part of Africa's largest country and deprived the rest of stability, growth and development. More than two million people died, four million were uprooted and some 600,000 people sought shelter beyond Sudan's borders as refugees.

The conflict between the North and the South erupted in 1955, one year before Sudan gained its independence. At the time of negotiations for Sudan's independence, the southern representatives had been given assurances that their demands for greater autonomy would be given full consideration, but the subsequent government's policy ran counter to those promises and vigorously pursued policies of Arabization and Islamization.

The army seized power in 1958 and ruled through a military government until 1964, when it stepped down in favour of an interim civilian government. But elections in 1965 were inconclusive, the coalition government of Mohammed Ahmed Mahgoub was weak and, in 1969, Colonel Jaafar al Nimeiri seized power in a bloodless coup. His 10-member Revolutionary Command Council ruled Sudan through 1985, with a priority on ending the insurgency in the south. The GoS signed the Addis Ababa Accords with one of the southern factions, the Southern Sudan Liberation Front (SSLF), on 27 March 1972, guaranteeing autonomy for a southern region comprising the provinces of Equatoria, Bahr al Ghazal, and Upper Nile. Stability eluded the government, however, and several failed coup attempts against Nimeiri occurred over the next 13 years.
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74 See UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations’ UN Mission in Sudan website.
75 For a concise summary of issues, see also the United Kingdom Department for International Development Country Engagement Plan for Sudan December 2004.
The North-South conflict worsened considerably in 1983 and Nimeiri decided to re-divide the South into three small regions, each with its own assembly. However, in September he announced the imposition of Sharia law. Even though the National People's Assembly rejected this proposed constitutional amendment declaring Sudan a formal Islamic state, the situation in the South continued to deteriorate. In the meantime, the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) had emerged as the political expression of this dissatisfaction and rapidly gained military control over large areas of the south.

In March 1985 public discontent (provoked largely by a rise in food prices) culminated in a general strike and a bloodless military coup, and on 30 June 1989, Brigadier Omar Hassan Ahmad al-Bashir seized power and formed a 15-member Revolutionary Command Council (RCC) for National Salvation, which declared its primary aim to be the resolution of the southern conflict. The new regime's proximity to the fundamentalist National Islamic Front (NIF)/Muslim Brotherhood, led by Dr. Hassan al-Turabi (the former deputy Prime Minister), became immediately apparent. Negotiations with the SPLM immediately collapsed over the issue of Islamic law. Hostilities resumed at the end of October 1989. The Sharia, once rejected in 1984, was again introduced in 1991 and the civil war continued.

The Army's fortunes took a turn for the better when the SPLA began to split into tribal factions. This GoS approach of 'divide and conquer' is a long-standing strategy that continues to be used successfully to this day. The SPLA was further weakened by the overthrow of its benefactor, Ethiopian President Mengistu. SPLA rebels were driven out of their southern strongholds and pushed toward the Ugandan border, signifying serious problems for the anti-Khartoum forces.

But support came to the SPLM/A from some of Sudan's neighbouring states, especially Uganda and Ethiopia, who were growing increasingly irritated by the Sudanese government's aggressive espousal of Islam. In 1995, the SPLA, now re-armed and re-supplied, took back territory lost during the 1980s. Khartoum now faced not only military setbacks but a significant drought and an economy that was in shambles.

In an effort to re-establish its legitimacy, the Turabi/Bashir-led government held elections in March 1996. Bashir was elected President while Turabi was elected to the National Assembly (heading the National Congress Party - the renamed NIF). The election gave Turabi enough political power to remove Bashir from the presidency and to begin placing army officers, who were both Muslim and loyal to him rather than to Bashir. In December 1999, President al-Bashir dissolved the National Assembly and declared a state of emergency after a parliamentary power struggle. During the 2000 elections Bashir won 85 percent of the vote. Soon thereafter, Bashir had Turabi arrested.

In May 2001, President Bashir and SPLA rebel leader John Garang agreed to meet in Nairobi to negotiate an end to the civil war, but the Sudanese government refused to meet Garang's demands: a provision for the separation of church and state, the right to self-determination, the creation of an interim constitution, and the creation of an interim government.

The 'war on terrorism' following 11 September had significant implications for Sudan, as the Khartoum regime had been closely linked with Osama bin Laden and other radical Islamist groups and was threatened with political and economical isolation for being branded a country in support of Islamic terrorism. This together with a further declining economy, the inability to exploit its oil wealth because of the war, the rising cost of the war and the realization by both sides that victory could not be won on the battlefield, forced the parties, encouraged by great international pressure, to negotiate for peace.
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June 2002, the Inter-Governmental Agency for Development (IGAD) renewed mediation efforts between the government and rebels. These eventually led to a Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in 2005.78

**Actors**79

**Main Political Parties**

**Muslim Brotherhood / National Islamic Front / National Congress Party**

The Muslim Brotherhood, which originated in Egypt, has been active in Sudan since its formation in 1949. Its objective in Sudan has been to institutionalize Islamic law throughout the country. Dr. Hassan Abd Allah al-Turabi, former dean of the School of Law at the University of Khartoum, had been the Muslim Brotherhood’s secretary-general since 1964. He began working with Nimeiri in the mid-1970s, and, as his attorney general in 1983, played a key role in the controversial introduction of Sharia. After the overthrow of Nimeiri, Turabi was instrumental in setting up the National Islamic Front (NIF), a Brotherhood-dominated organization that included other political parties as well. The National Congress Party (NCP), Sudan’s ruling party, was created in 1998 by some former NIF politicians. Since then, the NCP has consolidated its power. At the last legislative elections, in December 2000, the party won 355 out of 360 seats. Although political parties were legalized in 1999 after a 10-year ban, the opposition largely boycotted the general election in 2000 that saw President al-Bashir re-elected with 86.5 per cent of the vote. Under the power-sharing arrangements agreed with the SPLM/A in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), which came into effect in July 2005, the NCP retains a majority stake in the new Government of National Unity, occupying 234 of the 450 seats in the National Assembly.

**Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A)**

The Sudan People’s Liberation Movement (SPLM) and its military wing the Sudan People’s Liberation Army (SPLA) – known collectively as Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) – is a Sudanese rebel movement turned political party. Based in Southern Sudan, the SPLM/A fought in the Second Sudanese Civil War against the Sudanese government from 1983 to 2005. It was founded by John Garang and Salva Kiir Mayardit, among others. By 1989 the SPLA’s strength had reached 20,000 to 30,000; by 1991 it was estimated at 50,000 to 60,000. Over the years, the SPLM/A has splintered and re-merged a number of times. At one point in the early 1990s, there were three main factions: the SPLA Torit faction led by John Garang; the SPLA Bahr-al-Ghazal faction led by Carabino Kuany Bol; and the South Sudan Independence Movement led by Riek Machar. By January 2002, most of the various splinter groups had reconciled under Garang’s leadership.80 The SPLM/A finally ceased hostilities with the government in the two years of
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78 For a detailed chronology of key events during Sudan’s 21-year civil war as of 31 December 2004, see the Reuters website.
79 For more details of political and military organizations, see Mark Simmons and Peter Dixon (eds), Peace by Piece: Addressing Sudan’s Conflicts, London, Conciliation Resources, 2006, p.83.88.
80 SPLM/A-Nasir was the Nuer-dominated southern splinter group formed by the split of Riek M achar, Lam A kol and Gordon Kong from the SPLM in 1991. Renamed the SPLM/A-United in 1993, it split again into the Southern Sudan Independence Movement (SSIM/A) headed by Riek M achar and the SPLM/A-United headed by Lam A kol. Although Lam A kol was a member of the NCP from the signature of the Khartoum Peace Agreement in 1997 until his resignation in 2002 when he formed the Justice Party, SPLM/A-United still has some following among his native Shilluk. A kol rejoined the SPLM/A and in 2005 became Foreign Minister for the Government of National Unity. Riek M achar went on to form the Southern Sudan Defence Forces (SSDF) in 1997 and then the Sudan People’s Democratic Forces (SPDF) in 2000. The SPDF was formed in conjunction with the Union of Democratic Sudanese Forces (USDF), led by Taban Deng Gai, who had been expelled from the governorship of Unity State by Paulino M atip’s militia. The SPDF merged with SPLM/A in January 2002. The SSDF continues to operate in Upper Nile with the support of those in the SPDF, SSDF and SSIM who did not support M achar, but a major SSDF faction led
negotiations that led to the 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). Under the terms of this agreement, the SPLM/A now controls the Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS) and has a 28 per cent stake in the Government of National Unity.

**Main Opposition Parties**

*Umma Party* - During the last period of parliamentary democracy, the Umma Party was the largest political party in the country. Originally founded in 1945, the Umma was the political organization of the Islamic Ansar movement. It supporters followed the strict teachings of the Mahdi, who ruled Sudan in the 1880s. Although the Ansar were found throughout Sudan, most lived in rural areas of western Darfur and Kordofan. Since Sudan’s independence in 1956, the Umma Party has experienced alternating periods of political prominence (most recently in the 1986 elections that led to an Umma government under Al-Sadiq al-Mahdi until it was overthrown by the NIF in 1989) and persecution. The Umma was an Islamic party dedicated to achieving its own Muslim political agenda for Sudan. Today there are five active political factions of the Umma Party, each claiming political legitimacy. The most prominent of these factions is the Umma Party (Reform and Renewal) headed by Mubarak al Fadil al Mahdi, who is the first cousin of Sadiq al Mahdi and former *Interior Minister* when the Umma Party was last in power under Sadiq as *Prime Minister* from 1986 to 1989.

*Democratic Unionist Party* - The Democratic Unionist Party (DUP) is the oldest political party in Sudan and is similarly based on a religious order, the Khatmiyyah organization. Historically, the DUP has been plagued by factionalism, stemming largely from the differing perspectives of secular-minded professionals in the party and the more traditional religious values of their Khatmiyyah supporters. The party has long-standing relations with the SPLM with whom it signed the November Accords in 1988 in Addis Ababa, which were opposed by the NIF. The DUP boycotted the last legislative elections in December 2000.

**Other Political Parties**

A number of political parties have accepted seats in the National Assembly that were allocated in accordance with the CPA’s power-sharing formula, later modified on account of the Darfur Peace Agreement and Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement. In addition to the NCP, the following Northern Sudanese parties are represented in the National Assembly: National Democratic Alliance, Registered Democratic Unionist Party, Umma Party (Reform and Renewal), Federal Umma Party, Umma Party (Collective Leadership), Ansar Al-Suna, Muslim Brotherhood and Parties’ Forum. Southern Sudanese parties represented at the national level are: SPLM, Union of Sudan African Parties, United Democratic Salvation Front, United Democratic Front, Sudanese African National Union and Southern Sudan Democratic Forum. The Umma Party (Mainstream) and the Popular National Congress Party (led by Hassan al-Turabi) have declined to participate in the National Assembly. [vii]

**Other Armed Groups and tribal militia**

by Matip reunited with the SPLM/A in January 2006 as part of the South-South dialogue process. Machar returned to the SPLM/A in 2002 and became Vice-President of the Government of Southern Sudan after Garang’s death in July 2005. The Southern Sudan Unity Movement/Army (SSUM/A) was a pro-government militia headed by M atip, which fought against SSDF for control of oil-rich Unity State. Former SSUM/A commander Peter Gadet now runs a militia based in Unity State. Many southern groups formed humanitarian wings: the SPLM/A’s is the Southern Sudan Relief and Rehabilitation Agency (SRRRA), headed by Elijah Malok Aleng; the SPLM/A-Nasir’s was the Relief Association of Southern Sudan (RASS) and the SPLM/A United’s under Lam A kol was the Fashoda Relief and Rehabilitation Association (FRRA). Source: Addressing Sudan’s conflicts, Issue 18, Conciliation Resources, London 2006. Peace by piece: Addressing Sudan’s conflicts Issue Editors: Mark Simmons and Peter Dixon, pp 83-88.
Armed violence in Southern Sudan has been a consequence of the country’s history of civil war and localized conflicts between competing ethnic groups. The government’s policy of manipulation and exploitation from the periphery was pursued not only through the use of the armed forces but also through proxy militias. Public authorities frequently avoided accusations of waging war by making their proxies out for ‘bandits’ or describing their activities as ‘tribal conflict’. These circumstances have led to the emergence of an array of armed groups in Southern Sudan. Small Arms Survey has documented the one time existence of at least seventy armed groups with different interests and areas of control. [i] Although many of the armed groups ultimately joined forces with the SPLM/A, the frequent fragmentation of these groups served to prolong the armed violence in Southern Sudan. [ii]

The CPA stipulated that all existing Other Armed Groups aligned to either the Government of Sudan or SPLA should either be integrated into the organized forces of one of the Parties (army, police, prisons or wildlife service), or disarmed, demobilized and reintegrated into civilian life. The peace agreement did not lead to an immediate cessation of armed violence. Armed groups continued to be manipulated by the CPA parties and hostilities continued between the SPLA and other armed groups that refused to disband or integrate. [iii]

The raiding of tribal militia, clashes between pastoralist groups competing over grazing land and access to water, incursions by the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) and common predatory activity also contributed to escalating rates of armed violence in the wake of the CPA. [iv]

As part of the South-South dialogue process, on 8 January 2006, the SPLA signed the Juba Declaration on Unity and Integration of SPLA and SSDF with Paulino Matip, the leader of the Southern Sudan Defence Force (SSDF), an umbrella organization comprising the majority of Other Armed Groups formerly aligned with the Sudanese Armed Forces.[v] The SPLA’s integration of Other Armed Groups is largely complete, although integration of other new militia groups continue. Meanwhile, a small number of former SSDF soldiers have opted to align with the Sudanese Armed Forces. [v]

**Peace Negotiations**

**The long way to the Comprehensive Peace Agreement**

The SPLM/A insurrection broke out in 1983 and, with support from the Warsaw Pact countries and neighbouring countries, it quickly became a national crisis. Various Sudanese governments achieved little progress in resolving the SPLM/A grievances. Key issues involved accepting the SPLM/A as a national party with an agenda for reconstructing the entire country, and its demands to suspend the Sharia laws introduced by Nimeiri, end defence agreements with Arab countries and hold a constitutional conference. In March 1986, at Koka Dam in Ethiopia, agreement was reached on all the SPLM/A's demands but the refusal of key major parties (DUP and NIF) to participate in the discussions undermined the agreement.

The next prospect of ending the war was the DUP-SPLM/A agreement in November 1988, essentially affirming all of the SPLM/A's demands, including the holding of a constitutional conference. However, the DUP-SPLM/A accord was not implemented. Significantly, despite popular support, the agreement was strongly opposed by the NIF, which then left the government. As arrangements for the constitutional conference proceeded, a group of army officers with ties to the NIF (and led by Lt-General Omar Al-Bashir, the current President of Sudan) seized power. This action effectively ended internal Sudanese efforts at peace-making.

Subsequent peace initiatives were to be dominated by the regional and international communities. Moreover, the 1991 overthrow of the regime of Mengistu Hailemariam in Ethiopia (the SPLM/A’s foremost foreign supporter) and a schism within the rebel movement that led to the defection of Dr. Riek Machar and his Nuer followers in the same year, seriously weakened the SPLM/A. That confluence of events led
the GoS to look increasingly to a military victory, and not peace negotiations, to bring the conflict to an end.

The Inter-Governmental Authority on Drought and Desertification (IGADD, the forerunner of today's IGAD) took up the peace process as its member states had a clear interest in containing Sudan's civil war and stopping the spread of political Islam. IGADD established a Declaration of Principles (DoP) that included a number of provisions relating to human rights and the stipulation that the unity of Sudan be given priority, that its government should be secular and democratic, and that resources be equitably shared. Although the IGAD Peace Initiative had some genuine accomplishments (a well-thought-out DoP, workable relations with the belligerents, an institutional focus in the Sudan Secretariat, and international legitimacy) it had become apparent to most analysts and the belligerents by late 2001 that the process needed invigoration, and this could only come through international engagement led by the US.81

The US President's Special Envoy to Sudan, Senator Danforth, proposed a series of confidence-building measures, comprising a cease-fire in the Nuba Mountains, zones and times of tranquility, a commission to report on the issue of slavery, and an end to attacks on civilian targets (all of which achieved some, but not complete, compliance).82

The US administration repeatedly made it clear that it supported regional efforts led by IGAD, and the support of the UK, Norway and Italy, led by the US, breathed life into the faltering IGAD peace process, and their sustained engagement proved critical to achieving the Machakos Protocol and to the continuing progress since then.83

The Machakos Protocol was a breakthrough in two key areas. First, the SPLM/A agreed that Sharia would remain the source of legislation in the North, while the South would be governed by a secular administration. Second, Khartoum accepted an internationally monitored referendum that would be held after a transition period of six and a half years, in which the South would decide whether to secede or continue to exist within a united federal Sudan. The Machakos Protocol also constituted a framework for negotiation of the outstanding issues and outlined the basic tenets of the final peace agreement. A Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) on Cessation of Hostilities was signed in October 2002 and, in February 2003, the parties signed an addendum to the cessation of hostilities to strengthen the implementation of the MoU. A significant provision of the addendum was the creation of a Verification and Monitoring Team (VMT), which comprised the two parties plus personnel and aircraft from the existing Civilian Personnel Monitoring Team (CPMT), IGAD, African Union (AU), observer nations and other nations acceptable to the parties.

In September 2004, when the parties concluded negotiations on security arrangements without the IGAD mediators, both parties described the peace process as 'irreversible.' Yet as negotiations of details pertaining to a formal cease-fire agreement and modalities to implement the protocols seemed to drag on endlessly, the United States used its presidency of the UN Security Council to convene a Security Council session in Nairobi, in November 2004, to press the parties to conclude a comprehensive peace accord by the end of 2004. On 9 January 2005, both parties signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) in Nairobi, concluding the IGAD peace process.

Missions established as a result of the various peace processes

82 Ibid.
83 Ibid.
In January 2002, following diplomatic activity by United States Special Envoy John Danforth, the GoS and SPLM/A reached agreement on Danforth's four tests for the parties to demonstrate their commitment to the peace process. These four tests were:

- an internationally-monitored ceasefire agreement in the Nuba Mountains to enable humanitarian relief;
- commitment to an international verification mechanism to monitor an agreement not to target civilians in the south;
- an international eminent persons commission to investigate the problem of slavery in the Sudan; and
- establishment of zones and days of 'tranquility' in the conflict areas where health agencies could carry out polio, guinea worm and bovine rinderpest campaigns.\(^{84}\)

**Joint Monitoring Mission / Joint Military Commission (JMC) - Nuba Mountains / Southern Kordofan**

Brokered by the US and Swiss governments, the Nuba ceasefire was an undertaking by the Sudanese government and SPLM/A to end the abduction of civilians; allow international monitors to investigate attacks on civilians; and establish tranquility to facilitate the delivery of humanitarian aid in the Nuba region of Southern Kordofan, south-central Sudan.

The negotiated ceasefire, which came into force on 22 January 2002, effectively ended major fighting in the Nuba Mountains and permitted humanitarian operations to avert a potential famine in the region. As part of the ceasefire agreement, the JMC began work on 20 March 2002 under the political direction of the Friends of the Nuba Mountains, 12 European and North American countries that funded the JMC and provided its 39, mostly civilian, international personnel. With a budget of approximately $18 million per year, the JMC carried out its monitoring responsibilities with mixed teams, consisting of representatives of the SPLM/A, the government and international members. Operating in a permissive environment with the support of both parties to the ceasefire, the monitoring teams were unarmed. The teams conducted joint patrols, investigated complaints, inspected humanitarian aid, facilitated conflict resolution and cross-ceasefire line meetings and enabled the free movement of civilians and goods.

The Nuba Mountains ceasefire and its implementation provided a model for the entire Sudanese peace process, particularly due to its historic interaction with both the North and the South. A baseline study on the Nuba Mountains, carried out by the Office of the UN Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator in Sudan in November 2002, said the ceasefire had contributed to an improvement of people's lives and facilitated increased freedom of movement, as well as improved access to assets and resources. As a result of the progress in Nuba, the parties were encouraged to move on towards negotiating a final peace deal for the region in later rounds of talks, which also focused on the disputed areas of western Upper Nile and southern Blue Nile. The JMC handed over its responsibilities to the United Nations shortly after UNMIS was established.

**Civilian Protection Monitoring Teams (CPMT)**

The CPMT began operations in late 2002 to monitor alleged abuses against civilians in disputed regions of Sudan, and the CPMT mechanism was hailed for addressing one of the most significant components that had been missing in the Sudan peace process: human rights and humanitarian verification and reporting. The CPMT's strength was its logistical capacity and military analysis and, before its work was significantly limited through interference from the GoS, the CPMT was able to provide an especially authoritative
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source of documentation for violations from January though early March 2003. Humanitarian observers said the CPMT had bridged a gap that could not have been filled by OLS, whose humanitarian nature would have been jeopardized by documenting and reporting on abuses. Critics of the CPMT argued that its mandate remained unclear and its progress was slow, probably due to a lack of personnel with knowledge and experience of Sudan, its peoples and history.

Verification Monitoring Teams (VMT)

Another major breakthrough in the peace process came in October 2002 with the signing of a MOU on Cessation of Hostilities, thereby undertaking, among other things, ‘to take all necessary steps to facilitate the immediate voluntary return of the civilian population of western Upper Nile to their villages.’ Under the same MOU, the parties agreed to allow ‘unimpeded humanitarian access to all areas and for people in need, in accordance with the Operation Lifeline Sudan [OLS] Agreement.’

On 5 February 2003, the parties signed an addendum agreement that further strengthened the October 2002 MOU. It also announced the formation of a joint military Verification and Monitoring Team (VMT), which would incorporate elements of the work of existing Civilian Protection Monitoring Teams (CPMTs) already working on the ground to verify reports of civilian violations, but would also expand to include the monitoring and investigation of violations of the MoU, especially those related to the cessation of hostilities and the supply of weapons and ammunition. Since the MoU also stipulated that both parties would ‘refrain from any acts of violence or other abuse on the civilian population,’ the VMT was to be a force with a mandate very similar to that of the CPMT. But rather than strengthening the scrutiny and investigation of military attacks on civilians, the introduction of the VMT eventually led to Khartoum’s suspending of access for the CPMT and attempts to stall the creation of a viable VMT force. Eventually, the VMT was established and carried out a number of investigations of ceasefire violations, although its range of action and level of success continued to be limited until its disbandment shortly after the arrival of UNMIS.

Comprehensive Peace Agreement

The signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) on 9 January 2005 between the Government of the Republic of the Sudan (GoS) and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) marked the end to 22 years of protracted civil war.

The CPA consists of six separate Protocols and five sets of Implementation Modalities, agreed to over a period of two and a half years of negotiations between the government and the SPLM, which were facilitated by the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD). The various agreements focused on the major negotiating issues, with the Protocols generally describing substantive provisions and the Implementation Modalities setting forth detailed procedures, timing and responsible parties for each activity mandated by the Protocols.

Together the following documents make up the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA):

85 Eric Reeves, A Peace Agreement between Khartoum and the Sudan People’s Liberation Movement/Army: Has the Regime Done Anything but Change the Subject? 29 December 2009.
86 IRIN, Sudan: Problems and Progress with Civilian Protection, March 2003.
87 Ibid.
88 Ibid.
89 Ibid.
90 Ibid.
Protocols:
- The Machakos Protocol (signed 20 July 2002);
- Security Arrangements (signed on 25 September 2003);
- Wealth Sharing (signed 7 January 2004);
- Power Sharing (signed 26 May 2004)
- Resolution of the Conflict in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile (signed 26 May 2004);
- Resolution of the Abyei Conflict (signed 26 May 2004)

Implementation Modalities:
- Permanent Ceasefire and Security Arrangements (signed 31 December 2004);
- Machakos and Power Sharing (signed on 31 December 2004);
- Wealth Sharing (signed 31 December 2004);
- Resolution of the Abyei Conflict (signed 26 May 2004)
- Resolution of the Conflict in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile (signed 26 May 2004);

The CPA comprises the six protocols signed by the government and SPLM/A since the Machakos talks. In the protocol on power sharing, the parties agreed to establish a government of national unity inspired by democracy, respect for human rights, justice, devolution of power to the states and the government of southern Sudan, and good governance. The protocol also outlines the different layers of government and their compositions, and plans for general elections at all levels of government to be concluded by the end of the third year of the interim period. The wealth-sharing protocol details arrangements for sharing oil revenue and other natural resources. Although revenue from Sudan’s oil deposits will be divided evenly between North and South, communities in areas of oil production will have a say in oil contracts.

In the Framework Agreement on Security Arrangements during the interim period, the parties agreed to an internationally monitored permanent cease-fire and subsequent verification of redeployment of government and SPLA forces, demobilization of considerable numbers of both armies, and the monitoring of the creation of new joint and integrated units. In the interim period, there will be three forces government troops, SPLA forces, and integrated units made up of soldiers from both sides. In the protocol on the Resolution of Conflict in Southern Kordofan / Nuba Mountains and Blue Nile states, the parties reached an understanding on matters related to administration and popular consultations in the two areas. The protocol on the Resolution of Conflict in Abyei provides for mechanisms for a referendum on whether Abyei will remain part of the north or become part of the south.

In the Machakos Protocol, the parties resolved the status of state and religion and the right of self-determination for the people of southern Sudan. Islamic law applies only in the North, only for Muslims. An independent judiciary is established in both areas. While the parties established the unity of Sudan as a priority, the CPA provides for a six-month pre-interim process, followed by a six-year interim period during which interim institutions would govern the country and international monitoring mechanisms would be established. At the end of the period, i.e. 8 July 2011, the people of southern Sudan would vote in an internationally monitored referendum to confirm the unity of the Sudan or to vote for secession.

In the Protocol on Power Sharing, signed on 26 May 2004, the parties agreed to establish a Government of National Unity. The new Government of Southern Sudan exercises authority in the South. The parties also agreed to power sharing arrangements providing for fixed representation in national institutions, including parliament, among the formerly warring parties. The Protocol outlines the different layers of government as well as their composition and sets out a schedule for general elections at all levels of government to be completed, according to the implementation modalities, by the end of the fourth year of the interim period (i.e. July 2009). A number of other institutions, commissions and committees were also created.

---

92 The Comprehensive Peace Agreement with its protocols and implementation modalities.
93 Iyob and K hadiagala, p. 124
In the Framework Agreement on Security Arrangements, dated 25 September 2003, the parties agreed to an internationally monitored ceasefire that came into effect with the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. International monitoring and assistance would include the monitoring and verification of a large number of military personnel, including the redeployments of the parties’ respective armed forces and the monitoring of some 39,000 military personnel within joint/integrated units. The parties also agreed to implement disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programmes that would include the demobilization of military of both armies as well as of other armed groups.

The subsequent Agreement on Permanent Ceasefire and Security Arrangements Implementation Modalities during the Pre-Interim and Interim Periods of 31 December 2004 (the Ceasefire Agreement) details the monitoring and verification role of the United Nations peace support operation (UNMIS). In addition, the Ceasefire Agreement calls for the active participation of the UNMIS in a number of bodies to assist in the implementation of the Agreement, including the Ceasefire Political Commission, Ceasefire Joint Military Committee, Area Joint Military Committees and joint military teams to be deployed throughout the area of operations. The Ceasefire Joint Military Committee and the Area Joint Military Committees are chaired by UNMIS staff.

The detailed Wealth Sharing Agreement provided for a new national currency, created parallel central banks for North and South, and set specific revenue sharing formulas for the South and the disputed areas of Southern Kordofan state, Blue Nile state, and Abyei (the so-called Three Areas). The Government of Southern Sudan and the central government are to split all oil and other revenue derived from the South evenly. Separate southern and National Reconstruction and Development Funds will be charged with reconstruction, resettlement, reintegration, and development.

A boundary commission is established to fix the North-South line of demarcation. In accordance with the Protocol on the Resolution of the Conflict in the Abyei Area of 26 May 2004, Abyei’s position in the North or the South is to be determined by the binding judgment of the Abyei Boundary Commission and a referendum. In the Protocol on the Resolution of the Conflict in Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States of 26 May 2004, the parties reached understanding on matters related to administration, popular consultation and other issues in respect of the two conflict areas.

**Negotiations Timeline**

**Negotiations**

**Pre-1989**

- **Addis Ababa Agreement** between the Government of Sudan and the SSLM /Anyaa Nya, Addis Ababa, 27 February 1972
- **Koka Dam Declaration** by the SPLM/A and NANS, Koka Dam. 24 March 1986
- **November Accords** between the SPLM/A and DUP, Addis Ababa, 16 November 1988

**1989-2001**

- **Frankfurt Declaration** by the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A-Nasir, Frankfurt, January 1992
- **Agreement on Reconciliation of the divided SPLM/SPLA**, between the SPLM/A-Torit and SPLM/A-Nasir, Abuja, 19 June 1992
- **The Nairobi Communiqué** of the National Democratic Alliance, Nairobi, 17 April 1993

---

• The Washington Declaration by the SPLM/A and SPLM/A-United, Washington, DC, October 1993
• Declaration of Principles (IGADD), Nairobi, 20 July 1994 (signed by the Government of Sudan July 1997)
• Chukudum Agreement between the SPLM/A and Umma Party, Chukudum, Sudan, December 1994
• Political Charter between the Government of Sudan and the SPLA-United, 26 April 1995
• Asmara Declaration by the NDA (DUP, Umma, SCP, USAP (Surur), SPLM/A, Trades Union, Legitimate command, Beja Congress, SAF, Independents), Asmara, June 1995
• Operation Lifeline Sudan Agreement on Groundrules between the SPLM/A and UNICEF, July 1995; between the SSIM/S and UNICEF, August 1995; between the SPLM/A-United and UNICEF, May 1996
• Political Charter between the Government of Sudan, the SSIM/A and SPLM/A-Bahr el Ghazal Group, 10 April 1996
• Declaration of Principles for the Resolution of the Nuba Mountains Problem between the Government of Sudan and the Nuba Mountains United SPLM/A, Nairobi, 31 July 1996
• Sudan Peace Agreement (or Khartoum Peace Agreement) between the Government of Sudan, the SSDF, the SPLM/A Bahr el-Ghazal; the SSIG; the EDF; the USAP and the Bor Group, Khartoum, 21 April 1997
• Fashoda Peace Agreement between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A-United, Fashoda, 20 September 1997
• Wunlit Dinka-Nuer Covenant, Wunlit, 10 March 1999
• Waat Lou-Nuer Covenant, Waat, 8 November 1999
• Lililir Covenant (Anyuak, Dinka, Jie, Kachipo, Murle Nuer) Lililir, May 2000
• Memorandum of Understanding between the SPLM and the Popular National Congress, Geneva, 19 February 2001
• Kisumu Declaration, Kisumu, June 2001

2002

• Nairobi Declaration on Unity by the SPLM/A and the SPDF, 6 January 2002
• Nuba Mountains Ceasefire Agreement between the Government of Sudan, the SPLMNuba, Burgenstock, 19 January 2002
• Machakos Protocol between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Machakos, 20 July 2002
• Memorandum of Understanding on the Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Machakos, 15 October 2002
• Agreement on the extension of the Memorandum of Understanding on the Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Nairobi, 18 November 2002
• Memorandum of Understanding on Aspects of Structures of Government between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Nairobi, 18 November 2002
• Kampala Declaration, (civil society groups), Kampala, 24 November 2002
• Towards a brighter future for the Nuba Mountains (Resolutions of the All-Nuba Conference), Kauda, 5 December 2002

2003

• Memorandum of Understanding regarding Points of Agreement on Power Sharing and Wealth Sharing between the Government of the Sudan and the SPLM/A, Karen, 6 February 2003

Addendum to the Memorandum of Understanding on Cessation of Hostilities between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Karen, 4 February 2003
Cairo Declaration by the SPLM/A, the DUP and the Umma Party, Cairo, 24 May 2003
Framework Agreement on Security Arrangements during the Interim Period between the Government of the Sudan and the SPLM/A, Naivasha, 25 September 2003
Jeddah Agreement between the Government of Sudan and the NDA, Jeddah, December 2003

2004

Agreement on wealth sharing during the pre-interim and interim period between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Naivasha, 7 January 2004
A Charter for Peace agreed at the Nuer Fangak People’s Peace Conference, Fangak, 4 April 2004
Protocol between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A on the Resolution of Conflict in Southern Kordofan/Nuba Mountains and Blue Nile States, Naivasha, 26 May 2004
Protocol between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A on the Resolution of the Abyei Conflict, Naivasha, 26 May 2004
Protocol on Power Sharing between the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Naivasha, 26 May 2004
The Nairobi Declaration on the Final Phase of Peace in the Sudan by the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Nairobi, 5 June 2004
Joint Communique between the Government of Sudan and the United Nations on the Occasion of the visit of the Secretary General to Sudan, Khartoum, 3 July 2004
Declaration on the Conclusion of IGAD Negotiations on Peace in the Sudan by the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A, Gigiri, Nairobi, 19 November 2004
The Implementation Modalities of the Protocol on Power Sharing dated 26th May 2004, between the Government of Sudan and SPLM/A, Naivasha, 31 December 2004
Agreement on implementation modalities of the protocols and agreements between the Government of the Sudan and the SPLM/A, Naivasha, 31 December 2004
Agreement on Permanent Ceasefire and Security Arrangements Implementation Modalities during the Pre-Interim and Interim Periods between the Government of the Sudan and the SPLM/A, Naivasha, 31 December 2004

2005


DARFUR History

Immediate Trigger

The current war in Darfur began in late 2002 and early 2003 when two rebel groups, the Sudanese Liberation Movement/Army (SLM/A) and the Justice and Equality Movement (JEM) launched a series of raids and attacks against government police and military installations in the Jebel Mara region of the Darfur states. In April 2003, these actions culminated in a dramatic and unexpected attack on the El 96 Ibid.
97 It should be noted that some analysts report that the first joint Zaghawa-Fur raid took place in February 2002 against a police station in Golo, much like a similar raid almost exactly a year later that is more often
Fasher military installations that destroyed a small number of fixed-wing and rotary-wing aircraft, killed a large number of government military personnel and led to the capture of the base’s senior government military officer against very modest loses for the rebels.98

Although the immediate cause for rebel action was, broadly speaking, a matter of self-defence by the Fur and Zaghawa, African tribes (identified by themselves and the government as African) in face of increasing attacks from militia fighters from Arab-identified tribes over access to land and water,99 the SLM/A was convinced that the Arab militia were being directed by Khartoum. This knowledge alongside the historic marginalization of Darfur by the central government was the basis for identifying their target as the central government, not the Arab tribes of Darfur.100

The central government in Khartoum (GoS) was aware of the rising tensions in the Darfur region prior to the outbreak of fighting. In 2002, GoS had sent stern warnings to would-be rebel groups that any effort to follow the example of the SPLM/A’s violent campaign in South Sudan would be met with decisive and punishing force by Khartoum.101 However, while the government did, in fact, respond to the initial rebel campaign with military force, the Sudanese army was under-strength, ill-prepared and ill-equipped to contain the more mobile rebel forces on the open and arid terrain of Darfur. Also many of the troops the Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) brought from the battlefields of South Sudan were Darfurian and reluctant to fight their own people.

The government therefore had to rely increasingly on airpower (converted Antonov bombers and helicopter gunships) to counter the fast moving rebels in Land Cruisers, and the success of the El Fasher operation, among other rebel victories, convinced the Khartoum regime that a conventional military response would not be sufficient to quell the rebellion. The government decided to adopt a strategy centred on the use of local militia groups and set in motion the unleashing of the now notorious ‘janjaweed’ militia and their scorched-earth tactics. While the rebels have not been, to date, defeated by the combination of militia and regular GoS forces, the civilian toll of the government’s strategy in terms of dead, wounded and displaced has been enormous.

**Deeper Roots**

cited as the first rebel operation in the Darfur conflict. See, for example, Julie Flint and Alex de Waal, *Darfur: A Short History for a Long War*, (London: Zed Books, 2005), p 77.
102 This direct link between the GoS and the janjaweed is discussed in the findings of *The Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to the Secretary General, S/2005/60, 1 February 2005*, paras 66-9.
The root causes of the Darfur war are a historically complex set of trends and developments that reach far beyond what some identify as 'tribal conflict'.

Darfur or 'Land of the Fur' has long been shared by many different peoples: farmers, herders, traders and pilgrims. Tensions and conflicts between various groups were not uncommon throughout history, either as an independent sultanate or as an annexed province of Sudan post-1916. But, these conflicts were largely contained or resolved through tribal systems of governance and dispute settlement.103 This generally stable system came under sustained political and natural pressures roughly 30 years ago, and this combination of factors set the stage for what one analyst has called the worst violence Darfur has seen in over 100 years.104

1. **Marginalisation**: The conflict in Darfur must first be understood in the context of general and long-standing marginalisation and under-development, first by the British and then under successive Khartoum regimes. The Darfur region, along with the other peripheral regions of Sudan, has long suffered from central government (often intentional) policies that left the region as one of the least developed in the country.105 In 2000, a group of Darfuri government insiders quietly produced a pamphlet that was highly critical of Khartoum's economic and political policies concerning the country's regions (in particular, Darfur) and made the statistical case that economic and political power was dominated by a small group of Nilotic tribes from an area north of Khartoum. The clandestine pamphlet, *The Black Book* (or *kitab al-aswad*) was secretly published and distributed in the capital and the regions. It was an immediate sensation not so much because of its analysis (which was widely understood and accepted throughout the country) but because it had been compiled and distributed at all, thereby tackling a national taboo.106 Later it became clear that the group of government officials who published *The Black Book* had gone on to take leadership positions within the JEM.

2. **Political manipulation by Khartoum**: For many decades after its annexation to Sudan under British and Egyptian rule in 1916, Darfur enjoyed a large measure of semi-autonomous rule. The British abolished the Fur sultanate and established in its place a system of 'native administration' based on existing tribal structures. Each tribal administrator (chosen from chiefs or elders) was responsible for taxation, courts, law and order, etc. This system of 'indirect rule' initially survived Sudan's transition to independence in 1956, but soon found itself the target of new nationalist and socialist forces in Khartoum determined to remove what they saw as an unwanted colonial legacy. The first serious effort to dismantle the native administration system came in 1971, when then President Jaafar Nimeiri passed a law that re-organised local administration by replacing the tribal-based system in favour of regional, district and local councils. Conflicts soon erupted between tribes as the redistribution of administrative power often represented a loss of influence for more established tribes (those with traditional holdings) to those tribes who did not

---

103 While the system of Native Administration did provide a measure of relative stability within and among Darfur's tribes, it had significant weaknesses as a means to delivering basic social services or encouraging economic development. For a quick overview of the system's shortcomings, see, Alex de Waal and Helen Young, *Steps Towards the Stabilization of Governance and Livelihoods in Darfur, Sudan*, Washington DC, USAID, March 2005, paras 51 and 52.

104 Tanner claims that one needs to look back to the late 1880s to find such a costly conflict. See, Victor Tanner, *Rule of Lawlessness: Roots and Repercussions of the Darfur Crisis*, p. 3


106 For this point, see, Gérard Prunier, *Darfur: The Ambiguous Genocide*, p. 77.
have a traditional claim to a *dar* or territory. The fact that most of the *dar*-less tribes were identified as Arab nomadic tribes who would welcome the chance to acquire arable land was not lost on GoS or expansionist Arabist ideologues.

During the tenure of the democratically elected Al-Sadiq al Mahdi (1986-89), an effort was made to restore the system of native administration, but this was reversed by the 1989 National Islamic Front (NIF) coup led by current president Omar al-Bashir. In 1994, the NIF government re-organised Darfur into three states (North, South and West). The new state lines, however, were drawn through the Fur heartland and were seen as a gerrymandering effort to dilute Fur power and influence in the region to the advantage of Arab tribes. A year later, the governor of West Darfur divided that state into 34 emirates, a new administrative unit, which broke up Dar Masalit into 19 emirates, of which 13 went to the Masalit tribe and six to Arab tribes, some of whom were recent immigrants from Chad. As Mona Ayoub noted, this re-organisation served to dilute the traditional authority of the Masalit sultanate and aggravate inter-tribal tensions throughout West Darfur.

In addition to designing the new administrative boundaries as a means to weaken traditional sources of political power and influence of African tribes, the new administrative structures also afforded the GoS an opportunity to appoint new administrators (often ‘Arabs’) who answered to Khartoum, not the local population or tribal leaders. The net effect was the relatively successful conflict resolution and mediation mechanisms of the native administration system were slowly dismantled or manipulated by Khartoum through the 1990s. Khartoum is now directly inserted into inter-tribal affairs and, because so many of the top officials are identified as being ‘Arab’, the African tribes consider these changes as profoundly detrimental to their interests. For many African tribes, the final piece of evidence to confirm these suspicions was the politicisation of the Popular Defence Forces (PDF, regular militia) by GoS in 1999 through the appointment of Arabs to top positions within the militia. This action was seen as a further stacking of official resources against African tribes in settling disputes and clashes between tribes.

3. Environmental pressures: The population of Darfur has grown from 1.5 million in 1956 to 6.5 million today. The traditional livelihoods of herding and farming are, under optimum conditions, complementary in that the herds fertilize farmland and the farmers provide food to the nomads. However when the land base decreases and water becomes scarce, competition erupts as herds now invade farmland and access to waterholes decreases. With population increase and significant desertification invading arable lands, Darfur faces an ecological crisis. Traditional cyclical droughts and periods of famine aggravate these natural conditions. This dynamic had led to heightened tensions, if not clashes, between the involved tribes in the past, yet most of these disputes were managed by the traditional mechanisms. Today environmental changes have intensified resulting in greater pressure on tribal relations.

Compounding this development, local Arab leaders and the GoS encourage Arab immigration into Darfur from Chad and other parts of Sudan, thus affecting the ethnic and livelihood balance and adding more strain to the limited natural resources. It is clear that the changing demographic balance benefits Arab interests and plays into Khartoum’s strategy for political gains. While most analysts do not consider
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107 This issue is covered in detail in Musa A. Abdul-Jalil, Adam Azzain Mohammed and Ahmed A. Yousuf, _Native Administration and Local Governance in Darfur: Past and Future_ in Alex de Waal (ed), *War in Darfur and the Search for Peace*, pp. 49-51.
the environmental circumstances to be a central variable in explaining the conflict, it does seem fair to say that the increasing competition over dwindling natural resources has been a contributing factor.\(^{112}\)

4. Regional politics and proxy wars: Since the late 1970s, Darfur has been caught in the middle of ongoing political, ethnic and military manoeuvring among Chad, Sudan and Libya. The trans-border ethnic and tribal reality between Darfur and Chad has always meant that political and economic issues would invariably be felt on both sides of the porous border. But, the rise of Libya's pan-Arab nationalism (which fuelled violent and racist movements like the 'Arab Gathering') and the SPLM/A's apparent threat of moving into Darfur, both in the 1980s, introduced a new and dangerous element into Darfur's political equation: the creation and expansion of Arab tribal militia in Darfur.

GoS reached out to Libya for military support in its conflict with the SPLM/A in the South and Libya was willing to back GoS provided it received some concessions in return. Libyan military assistance was motivated, in part, by a desire to secure access for its troops and proxies to staging grounds in Darfur, from which it could attack, or destabilise, its opponents in neighbouring Chad. Libyan influence and presence in Darfur served to accelerate the polarisation process of tribal identity in the region as it sought to promote its brand of Arab supremacist and expansionist ideology through the arming of Arab-identified tribal militia.\(^{113}\) Chad eventually responded to this growing Darfur-based challenge by arming African-identified tribes (primarily the Fur) as a way to counter GoS and Libyan initiatives.\(^{114}\)

The Libyan role in Darfur diminished in the 1990s, in part, because its Chadian enemy, Hissène Habré, was overthrown in 1990 by a Chadian Zaghawa, Idriss Déby. Déby, who staged his successful campaign from Darfur, was backed by both Libya and GoS and, once in power, he moved to improve N'djamena's relations with Tripoli and Khartoum.

**Darfurian response**

The combination of environmental pressures, immigration, weakened tribal dispute settlement mechanisms and the dramatic increase in armed tribal militia seriously tested the peaceful co-existence among the various tribes. Serious conflicts along tribal lines were sparked in 1980s and 90s, in particular in 1987-89 and 1995-99. These conflicts, while eventually contained, were not settled definitely, so small-scale inter-tribal clashes continued. As noted above, however, some Darfurian leaders concluded by this time that tribal differences were being exacerbated and manipulated by the central government in Khartoum. Without access to a fair legal process, armed rebellion increasingly appeared to be the only recourse.

Future SLM/A leaders like Abdel Wahid Mohamed al Nur (a Fur) argued that, ultimately, the fight was against the GoS, not other tribes. But, the idea of direct confrontation with the central government was not an immediately popular approach among tribal leaders, in part, because people still remembered the disastrous results of a failed uprising launched in 1991 by a Darfurian named Daud Yahya Bolad, who led a SPLM/A force into Darfur only to be quickly defeated, captured and killed and have his network dismantled. Darfurian leaders, however, learned lessons from this failed effort and resolved to apply them

\(^{112}\) The uncertainty of the depth of the causal relationship between environmental degradation in Darfur and the on-going conflict is captured in, *University for Peace, Environmental Degradation as a Cause of Conflict in Darfur, Conference Proceedings, Khartoum, December 2004*, in particular, R.S. O'Fahey, ‘Conclusion,’ p. 94.

\(^{113}\) The full arc of Libya's involvement in Darfur during this period is discussed in Roland Marchal, _The Unseen Regional Implication of the Crisis in Darfur_ in Alex de Waal (ed), *War in Darfur and the Search for Peace*, chapter seven; and M. W. Daly, *Darfur's Sorrow: A History of Destruction and Genocide*, pp. 206-7, 217-20, 242-247.

in the next attempt. Chief among these lessons was the need to mobilize the Darfurian tribes (both Arab
and non-Arab) and not rely on outside forces to carry the day.\textsuperscript{115}

\textbf{The Civilian Toll}

This complicated set of circumstances brought the political situation in Darfur to a boiling point by the turn
of the 21st century. In the wake of early failures of the Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF), the central
government turned to the PDF and Arab tribal militia to suppress the rebels. This ‘counter-insurgency on
the cheap’ strategy did not crush the rebellion, but it ensured that the price paid by civilians would be
horrible.\textsuperscript{116} If the civilian population was not unintended ‘collateral damage’ then it was the deliberate
target of the militia, PDF or SAF, usually operating jointly.\textsuperscript{117}

In the many cases when villages were deliberately targeted, the scorched-earth tactics (which included
indiscriminate killings of civilians, widespread rape, destruction of homes, burning of crops, large-scale
theft of animals and the permanent contamination of water wells) strongly suggested a concerted effort to
clear non-Arab populations from certain areas. For many African tribes, the message was clear: get out.
By the summer of 2004, the United Nations was estimating the total number of displaced people had
reached 1.3 million\textsuperscript{118} and the International Crisis Group (ICG) reported in May 2004 an estimated death
total of 30,000.\textsuperscript{119} Both of these figures would increase dramatically over the following years.

\textbf{Actors}

\textbf{Government}

The \textit{Government of Sudan} is referred to by a number of acronyms which reflect various facets of its
character. In the Darfur context, it is still common to refer to the central government in Khartoum simply
as the GoS. Or, some may refer to it by the political party that has formed the government since the 1989
coup: its initial name, the National Islamic Front (NIF) or its current name, the National Congress Party
(NCP). Since the formation of the Government of National Unity (dominated by the NCP with the SPLM as
a junior partner) in July 2005 as called for in the CPA, the central government is also referred to as the
GNU. But, the formation of the GNU has had a limited impact on the Darfur crisis and many observers
hold the view that the NCP element of the new unity government continues to dominate Darfur policy.
Hence, in the Darfur context, the central government still is often referred to as the GoS or NCP.

In Darfur, the central government has three operational military tools at its disposal:

\textsuperscript{115} A concise overview of the Bolad misadventure is found in, Julie Flint, \textit{Darfur\_s Armed Movements}, pp. 142-3.

\textsuperscript{116} Alex de Waal used this term to characterise the GoS decision to rely on unruly Arab militia and the
Arab-dominated PDF to take the lead in fighting the rebels. See, Alex de Waal, 'Darfur, Sudan: Prospects
for Peace,' p. 128.

\textsuperscript{117} The Independent Commission of Inquiry devoted a great deal of attention to the issue of links between
the Arab tribal militia (janjaweed), the PDF and GoS and found sufficient evidence to conclude that ‘clear
links exist between the State and militias from all three categories. The close relationship between the
militias and the PDF, a State institution established by law, demonstrates the strong link between these
militias and the State as a whole.’ See, The Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to
the Secretary General, para 111 for this quotation and paras 111-5 for more details on the GoS-janjaweed
links and operating methods.

\textsuperscript{118} See, \textit{United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General to the Security Council pursuant to paragraphs 6

\textsuperscript{119} See, \textit{International Crisis Group, Darfur: Now or Never, Africa Report No. 80, 23 May 2004, p. i.}
• The Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) are the regular national armed forces that answer to the president of Sudan (commander-in-chief) through the Minister of Defence.
• The Popular Defence Forces (PDF) were established in late 1989 by the NIF as a counter-balance to the SAF and a vehicle for supporting the NIF’s Islamic programmes. The PDF were established by specific legislation and do not fall under the SAF’s command structure.
• The Janjaweed is a militia formed by the NCP to counteract the rebel offensive in Darfur. The Janjaweed are identified as Arab nomads who travel on camels or horses and have been accused of responsibility for many of the atrocities committed against the civilian population in Darfur. An arrest warrant has been issued for Ali Muhammad Ali Abd al-Rahman, also called Ali Kushayb, a Janjaweed leader, by the International Criminal Court for crimes against humanity. Many analysts no longer make distinctions between the PDF and the janjaweed because of Khartoum’s efforts to absorb many janjaweed members into the PDF in an effort to legitimise these fighters and claim that Khartoum is taking measures to reduce the janjaweed’s numbers.

Rebels

Sudan Liberation Movement / Army: The roots of the SLM/A lie in the clandestine efforts of a group of educated Darfurian opponents of the NIF regime to mobilize village self-defence committees. These committees were Fur, Zaghawa, and Masalit villagers established in the 1990s to fend off attacks by GoS-supported Arab militias. Renewed efforts were instigated in the late 1990s by Abdel-Wahid Mohammad Ahmad Nur, Ahmad Abdesh-Shafi’, Abdu Abdallah Isma’il, and Babiker Mohammad Abdallah to organize the SLM/A. The Fur was the largest ethnic group but the Zaghawa, traditionally regarded as raiders and warriors, were seen to have an advantage due to their presence on both sides of the Chad-Sudan border, as well as from their influence with the Chadian regime.

Abdul Wahid el-Nur, Fur, and Minni Minawi, Zaghawa, emerged as the two principal leaders of the SLM/A forces; but not without competition between the two, and their respective tribes, for control of the SLM/A. The enmity that developed, and endures, between Abdel-Wahid and Minni Minawi has been the source of personal rivalry on the ground in Darfur, among the Darfur diaspora and among the international community. These problems have significantly complicated the peace process and have influenced the fragmentation of the movement.

Justice and Equality Movement (JEM): The JEM was founded by Dr. Khalil Ibrahim in 2003. On the ground over the first few years, it was smaller and had a lower profile than the SLM/A, it controlled less territory and commanded fewer fighters. However, the JEM showed greater political maturity and built a political structure, including a congress or assembly. JEM has clear roots in Turabi’s branch of the NIF, though its leaders now denounce that legacy. Since the splintering of the SLM/A, which accelerated after the signing of the DPA in 2006, the JEM took on a larger and more aggressive military posture in the field which resulted in it assuming the leading combat role against GoS. This new status was underscored by JEM’s attack on Omdurman in May 2008.

SLA Minni Minawi: Minni Minawi’s faction of the SLA was the only rebel group to sign the DPA, and in this role he was named to the post of ‘Senior Assistant to the President of the Republic’ of the GNU. Since

120 A useful overview of these organizations is found in, The Report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to the Secretary General, paras 77-126.
121 The section on Rebel Actors draws on the work of Victor Tanner and Jérôme Tubiana, Divided They Fall: The Fragmentation of Darfur’s Rebel Groups, Small Arms Survey 2007.
122 Ibid.
signing the DPA, Minni has lost much of his support base and he has been accused of committing atrocities, alongside government forces, against Darfur’s civilian population.\textsuperscript{124}

After a process of fragmentation, which began prior to the signing of the DPA, the SLM/A and the JEM have suffered numerous configurations, fragmentations and rivalries with groups that present themselves as new rebel movements in Darfur. Some observers of the process have stopped acknowledging the multitude of groups laying claim to representing a Darfurian constituency because most of these new groups are viewed as opportunist organizations. In the post-DPA period,\textsuperscript{125} higher-profile rebel groups have included:

1. \textit{SLA Unity}: In the months leading up to the Abuja signing of the DPA, 19 SLM/A commanders split with Abdul Wahid over his decision to negotiate separately with the government. This group later became known as the ‘Group of Nineteen’ or the G-19, and was by the end of 2006 the strongest force in Darfur; allied to JEM and liaising with the first Arab rebel group the Popular Forces Army. This group proposed a Darfur Darfur Dialogue during the DPA negotiations. Later as more commanders from other forces joined them the G-19 changed its name to SLA Unity.\textsuperscript{126}

2. \textit{SLA Abdel Wahid}: is the section of the SLA still led by Abdul Wahid el-Nur. His refusal to sign the DPA increased Abdul Wahid’s popularity for a while, and he still maintains support among sectors of the Fur population and the IDPs, however his social bases have diminished considerably due to his indecisiveness, his distance from the battlefield and from the Fur population. His organization has splintered as he has been challenged by other Fur leaders. He currently is based in Paris.

3. \textit{SLA Abdul Shafi}: A former supporter of Abdul Wahid, Ahmed Abdel Shafi, broke from the movement in July 2006. He is a member of the Fur ethnic group and maintains a presence in the North Jebel Mara area. He attended the Juba talks that were aimed at unifying and reconciling the splintered movements ahead of the Sirte talks. This group is sometimes known as the “SLA Classic.”

4. \textit{JEM}: Still led by Khalil Ibrahim, the JEM has also suffered desertions and re-incorporations. The NMRD (the National Movement for Reform and Development) split from JEM in 2004 but in 2005 entered into talks with the government in El Fasher and laid down its arms, among much speculation that the government had actually orchestrated these manoeuvres hoping to weaken the JEM. The NMRD, also associated with Chad, has reappeared at different moments. After Abuja JEM, unlike other rebel factions significantly increased its number of fighters. In 2006, JEM was believed to have between 3 4,000 men and 100 200 vehicles (the number of vehicles held by any group is an indicator of its strength) in West and North Darfur, fighting alongside other non-signatory rebels. More recently JEM seems to be concentrated in West Darfur and along the Chadian border. Its positions close to the border are, in part, a reflection of the JEM’s role in Chadian politics as a key supporter of that country’s President Idriss Déby. Also, the JEM attack on Omdurman in May 2008 was a signal that its strength on the ground has increased over the past two years and that it was prepared to use its military strength in dramatic ways for political and propaganda objectives. Despite deadly clashes between JEM and the GoS, both parties signed an “Agreement of Good Will and Confidence-Building” on February 17, 2009 in Doha. The agreement did little to stop the fighting in Darfur and JEM temporarily withdrew from negotiations after Khartoum expelled 13 NGOs in response to the ICC’s arrest warrant for President al-Bashir.

5. \textit{United Resistance Front (URF)}: The URF was formed out of five Darfur rebel factions that met in Juba in April 2008, invited by the SPLM/A in order to attempt unification of the SLM/A. Two splinter groups from

\textsuperscript{125}In late 2007, former US Sudan Envoy, Andrew Natsios put the number of identifiable rebel groups at 27. See, Kelly Campbell, ‘Negotiating Peace Iin Darfur,’ USIP Peace Briefing, Jan. 2008.
the SLM/A, one breakaway group from the JEM, the NMRD and the United Revolutionary Forces Front came together as the URF.127 This marriage did not last long, however, as reports surfaced in the summer of 2008 that the URF has dissolved into three smaller groups.128

Throughout the conflict, the southern SPLM/A has maintained links with the Darfurian rebels through the National Democratic Alliance (NDA) in opposition to the NCP. Prior to the signing of the CPA, John Garang had promised to intervene to bring about a peaceful settlement in Darfur. Since the SPLM joined the Government of National Unity, and Garang’s subsequent death, however, the SPLM but has been unable to fulfill Garang’s promise. Intermittently over the past two years the SPLM have hosted Darfurian rebels in the South Sudan in order to promote the reintegration of the movement in preparation for renewed peace negotiations.

**Peace Process**


The start of the current Darfur conflict is widely considered to be the SLM/A attack on Gulu in February, 2003. Hostilities ensued and the first attempt at resolving the armed conflict occurred under the mediation of Idriss Déby, President of Chad with the signing of the Cessation Agreement. Peace negotiations were to begin fifteen days later. In November of the same year the ceasefire was extended and a commitment was made to facilitate delivery of humanitarian assistance, however by December the process had broken down.129

**Ceasefire Agreement** between the Government of Sudan (GoS) and the SLM/A, at Abéché, Chad on 3 September 2003

**Project of a Final Agreement on Appendices** between the GoS and the SLM/A, Abéché, November 2003

**Joint statement** by the GoS and SLM/A delegations, Abéché, 4 November 2003

Déby, assisted by the Chairperson of the Commission of the Africa Union, facilitated the signing of another Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement in April 2004 and the agreement for a ceasefire commission and deployment of observers in May 2004. The African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) began to deploy in June under a mandate to monitor compliance with the signed agreements and to investigate violations of the same. The humanitarian crisis was deemed as extremely serious by the African Union, as well as the ongoing violation of human rights and international humanitarian law.130

**N'djamena Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement on the Conflict in Darfur** between the GoS, the SLM/A and the JEM, N'Djamena, 8 April 2004

**Agreement between the GoS, the SLM/A and the JEM**, N'Djamena, 25 April 2004

---

Agreement with the Sudanese Parties on the Modalities for the Establishment of the Ceasefire Commission and the Deployment of Observers in the Darfur, proposal by the African Union, Addis Ababa, 28 May 2004

Meetings in Abuja led to the signing of two further agreements on the security and the humanitarian situation in Darfur, permitting free movement and access for humanitarian workers and assistance, and protection of civilians.  

Darfur remained peaceful for about one week after the signing and then violence erupted again reaching a high point when the SLM/A attacked Tawilla, North Darfur and took control of all police posts. The Sudanese army retaliated and drove the SLM/A out. Extensive casualties resulted and both sides denounced the ceasefire. A state of emergency was declared in North Darfur. (S/2004/947)

Protocol on the enhancement of the security situation in Darfur in accordance with the N'Djamena Agreement, between the Government of the Sudan, the SLM/A and the JEM, Abuja, 9 November 2004

Protocol on the improvement of the humanitarian situation in Darfur, between the Government of the Sudan, the SLM/A and the JEM, Abuja, 9 November 2004

In April 2005, the African Union pronounced that compliance with the signed agreements remained insufficient; attacks against civilians persisted and other violations of human rights and international humanitarian law. Also attacks against humanitarian workers and agencies, AMIS personnel and assets, inter-tribal violence, acts of banditry and attacks against commercial convoys all continued. It did welcome, however, the decision by the GoS to remove all Antonov bombers from Darfur. Strong requests were again made to bring AMIS to full operational capability by the end of May 2005. (AU-PSC Communiqué, 28 April, 2005, Addis Ababa). A lack of consistency was strongly evident between the discussions at the negotiating table and what was still happening on the ground. However, by July 2005 another Protocol and the Declaration of Principles had been signed. President Déby had by then ceased to be the mediator of the talks as conflict developed between Chad and Sudan.

Draft Framework Protocol for the Resolution of Conflict in Darfur between the GoS, the SLM/A and the JEM, Abuja, April 2005

Sudan’s Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) was signed on Jan. 2005, and during the following 16 months African Union mediators in Abuja tried to broker an agreement between the GoS and the Darfur rebels that would both resolve Darfuri grievances while also buttressing the CPA. Deadlines were imposed on the process in order to facilitate the arrival of UN troops to replace the under-resourced and inexperienced African Union peacekeeping mission in Darfur, while international observers pressured for a peace deal. Instead of ceding to the pressures, main factions of the rebel movement (SLA Abdul Wahid and JEM) refused to sign.  

While the document is very brief and vague beyond basic principles for future negotiations, and the other non-signatories refused to participate in the talks, the Doha agreement represents the first sign of political

---


132 See, “Sudan and JEM agree on peaceful resolution to Darfur conflict,” Sudan Tribune, 18 February 2009.
movement since mid-2006. Less than a month later, the process received a modest boost when five smaller rebel groups pledged to join the process.133

**Goodwill and confidence-building agreement to resolve Darfur conflict** between GoS and JEM, Doha, Qatar, 17 February 2009134

This potential significance of this development, however, was over-shadowed by the decision of the ICC to issue an arrest warrant for President Bashir. GoS reaction to the arrest warrant has been to expel aid workers and increase the rhetoric against the ICC and its supporters. It is difficult to anticipate the impact of the ICC decision on the Darfur peace process, but it does hold the potential to distract attention and energy from the nascent Doha process for some time.135

**Negotiations Timeline**

**2003**

- Ceasefire Agreement between the Government of Sudan and the SLA, Abeche, 3 September 2003
- Project of a Final Agreement on Appendices between the Government of Sudan and the Sudan Liberation Army, Abeche, November 2003
- Joint statement by the Government of Sudan and SLA delegations, Abeche, 4 November 2003

**2004**

- N'Djamena Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement on the Conflict in Darfur between the Government of Sudan, the SLM/A and the JEM, N'djamena, 8 April 2004
- Agreement between the Government of Sudan, the SLA and the JEM, N'Djamena, 25 April 2004
- Agreement with the Sudanese Parties on the Modalities for the Establishment of the Ceasefire Commission and the Deployment of Observers in the Darfur, proposal by the African Union, Addis Ababa, 28 May 2004
- Protocol on the enhancement of the security situation in Darfur in accordance with the N'Djamena Agreement, between the Government of the Sudan, the SLM/A and the JEM, Abuja, 9 November 2004
- Protocol on the improvement of the humanitarian situation in Darfur, between the Government of the Sudan, the SLM/A and the JEM, Abuja, 9 November 2004

**2005**

- Draft Framework Protocol for the Resolution of Conflict in Darfur between the Government of Sudan, the SLM/A and the JEM, Abuja, April 2005
- Agreement between the Government of Sudan and NDA (Cairo Agreement) Cairo, 18 June 2005

133 See, “Five Darfur rebel factions agree to join Doha process,” Sudan Tribune, 16 March 2009.
134 The text of the agreement can be found at, “TEXT: Goodwill and confidence-building agreement to resolve Darfur conflict,” Sudan Tribune, 18 February 2009.
2006

- **Declaration of Principles for the Resolution of the Sudanese Conflict in Darfur** by the Government of Sudan, the SLM/A and the JEM, Abuja, 5 July 2005.\(^\text{136}\)

- **Darfur Peace Agreement** between the Government of Sudan and the SLM/A, Abuja, 5 May 2006

- **Declaration of Principles for the Resolution of the Conflict in Eastern Sudan** between the Government of Sudan and the Eastern Front, Asmara, 19 June 2006

- **Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement** between the Government of Sudan and the Eastern Front, Asmara, 14 October 2006\(^\text{137}\)

**Eastern Sudan**

**Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement**

*Development priorities* An Eastern Sudan Reconstruction and Development Plan is to determine service, infrastructural and other priorities. The ESRDF is to be operational within 90 days of the ESPA (i.e., mid-January 2007), with US$100m in 2007 and US$125m per annum 2008-11.

*Security arrangements* A comprehensive and permanent ceasefire comes into force within 72 hours of the signing the ESPA; all militias or other armed groups in Eastern Sudan to be absorbed into the Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF). Monitoring is conducted by the High Joint Military Committee, chaired by Eritrean government. Willing and qualified EF combatants are to be incorporated into the SAF for a minimum of 2 years. A Joint Committee for Integration (5 government and 5 EF representatives, chaired by the SAF) are to identify those who are willing and qualified... and ensure adequate training for those who are integrated into SAF and proper support for those who return to civilian life. Prisoners associated with the conflict will be released within a week of the ESPA’s signature.

*Dialogue* A National Conference on Sudan’s administration is to be convened by the end of 2007; the government is to implement recommendations. An ESPA Consultative Conference is envisaged; a joint preparatory committee is to be established within a week of the signature.\(^\text{138}\)

**International Community** Updated December 31, 2009

---


\(^\text{138}\) *Piece by Piece: Addressing Sudan’s Conflict*, eds Mark Simmons and Peter Dixon, p. 53-53
United Nations

Early humanitarian relief efforts

Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS)

The substantial and long-lasting involvement of the United Nations in Sudan began when it brokered, in April 1989, an agreement with the GoS and the SPLM/A to establish Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS), a consortium of UN agencies, led by UNICEF and the World Food Programme, together with more than 35 NGOs. In response to widespread famine across southern and central Sudan caused by sustained drought and armed conflict, which killed an estimated 250,000 people in 1988, OLS provided humanitarian assistance through relief corridors via the air, river barges, and the rail road. Operating strictly on the basis of neutrality in the conflict, OLS provided emergency food aid to all civilians in need, on both sides of the military frontlines and whatever their political affiliation. OLS operations, which lasted until 2005, were divided into a northern Khartoum-based sector and a southern Nairobi-based sector, both of which reported to the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs. The OLS Ground Rules, as agreed between the UN and various factions of the SPLM/A, was then considered a considerable achievement in the implementation of humanitarian principles towards securing a sound basis on which to deliver humanitarian assistance outside the traditional, bilateral framework.

Operation Lifeline Sudan demonstrated that the international community, led by the United Nations, could find ways to implement the humanitarian imperative and meet human need in settings where political authority was contested. Under UNICEF’s lead, access was negotiated with all parties for humanitarian operations in all areas.

Furthermore, quite apart from its humanitarian mandate, the UN led operation is also credited with creating an atmosphere conducive to peace efforts. As SPLM official Lam Akol notes: ‘There was a profound connection between OLS and opportunities for peacemaking, even if peace was not its stated aim. The operation was mounted to ameliorate the suffering caused by war-induced famine, hence, the final solution to the problem lay in achieving peace. OLS also provided the donors, especially the US, with leverage or influence on the SPLM/A.’

However, OLS has also been criticized for having been manipulated by both parties and sustaining the conflict. Khartoum abused its power to veto relief flights and denying access to suit its military objectives. These restrictions prevented the World Food Program (WFP) from providing assistance to populations that faced food shortages ranging from 50 to 100 percent. Though not nearly as egregious as the government, the SPLA was also guilty of manipulating aid. Commentators have argued that the SPLA stole food and cattle from civilians, diverted food assistance to feed its troops, and used displaced civilians as bait to attract more relief supplies.

More information about Operation Lifeline Sudan and the transition into post-CPA relief efforts can be found in the Relief and Development section.

---

139 The difficult dynamics of providing humanitarian assistance in a time of war and under heavy restrictions are described by the International Crisis Group in Ending Starvation as a Weapon of War in Sudan, Africa Report No54, 14 November 2002.
141 OLS Ground Rules
142 United Nations Information Centre in Nairobi, UNICEF Lifeline Sudan
143 Lam Akol, Operation Lifeline Sudan: war, peace and relief in southern Sudan, Conciliation Resources, 2005.
Peace Support Operations

United Nations Advance Mission

Building on the momentum of the IGAD-led peace talks thus far, and in anticipation of the early conclusion of a peace agreement, the United Nations Security Council established in June 2004 a special political mission, the United Nations Advance Mission in the Sudan (UNAMIS). [ix] UNAMIS was mandated to prepare for the deployment of an envisaged peace operation in support of the imminent CPA.

The Special Representative of the Secretary-General and head of UNAMIS, Jan Pronk, led UN peacemaking support to the IGAD-mediated talks on the North-South conflict. In addition, a United Nations multidisciplinary team was assigned to the final stages of the peace talks in Naivasha, Kenya, to provide support and to ensure complementarities between the outcome of the negotiations and preparations for an expanded operation in the Sudan. UNAMIS and the United Nations country developed a strategy for the new peace operation that would integrate the entire UN presence in Sudan to ensure the most effective structure for supporting the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). [x]

United Nations Mission in Sudan

On 24 March 2005, the Security Council established the United Nations Mission in the Sudan (UNMIS), to support the implementation of the CPA and provide assistance on a number of other crucial post-conflict issues. The Council took this action in its resolution 1590 after determining that the situation in the country continued to constitute a threat to international peace and security. [xi]

More detailed information about the United Nations missions can be found in the UNMIS Profile section.

IGAD

In 1986, the governments of Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda formed the Intergovernmental Authority on Drought and Development (IGADD) for the limited purpose of increasing regional cooperation regarding the cross-border problems of drought and desertification. However, under the leadership of Kenyan President Daniel arap Moi, IGADD began to evolve into a vehicle for regional political dialogue, as it took up the Sudan peace process in 1994. IGADD established a Standing Committee on Peace in Sudan and facilitated peace negotiations between the GoS and the SPLM/A in Nairobi. The IGADD mediators presented the two sides with a Declaration of Principles (DoP) as the basis of discussion. In critical part, the DoP established several principles: a unified Sudan, a secular and democratic government and the equitable sharing of resources. In the event that the parties were unable to agree on these fundamental principles, the DoP held that the south would be entitled to hold a referendum on self-determination. The talks founder on the issue of self-determination, and the GoS refused to endorse the DoP. Although these initial efforts on Sudan were not successful, the member states saw the potential of a broader mandate, thus the organization was reborn in 1996 as the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), a more comprehensive regional entity for political and economic dialogue and cooperation. [xxi]

By the late 1990s, the GoS was prepared to return to the IGAD peace process and accept the DoP as the basis of negotiations. A permanent secretariat on the Sudan Peace Process replaced the former ministerial standing committee, and new round of talks began in February 2000. In July 2002, there was a breakthrough. The GoS and the SPLA/M signed the Machakos Protocol, which established a roadmap for the future of Sudan consisting of: (1) a 6 month “pre-interim” period for cessation of hostilities and establishment of a formal ceasefire; (2) a subsequent 6 year “interim period,” during which the ceasefire would be maintained and Sharia law would not be applied in the South; and (3) after the interim period, a referendum on self-determination in the South. At resumed negotiations in Machakos, on 15 October
2002, the parties signed a Memorandum of Understanding, agreeing to a cessation of hostilities during the talks. Further negotiations in 2003 resulted in agreements on power and resource sharing and security arrangements during the interim period. [xxiii]

The Naivasha Declaration of October 2003 established the framework for the final peace agreement and raised hopes that such an agreement would be in place by the end of the year. Progress was blocked, however, by continued disagreement over issues of power-sharing and the disputed regions of Abyei, the Nuba Mountains and the southern Blue Nile. Talks proceeded at the highest level with the participation of Sudanese First Vice-President Ali Uthman Muhammad Taha and SPLM/A leader, John Garang, culminating in the protocols of 26 May 2004 on power-sharing and the disputed regions. On 5 June 2004, under the auspices of IGAD, the parties signed the Nairobi Declaration, confirming their dedication and commitment to the Peace Process. After a special meeting of the UN Security Council, held in Nairobi in November 2004, the parties agreed to finalize the peace agreement by the end of the year. On 9 January 2005, the parties signed the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA), drawing together all of the protocols previously agreed by the GOS and the SPLM/A.

Key governments

Sudan shares borders with nine countries. Sudan’s relations with its neighbours have frequently been shaped by its internal situation as, at different times, Sudan’s neighbours have openly or covertly supported the SPLM/A in its armed struggle against the central government of Khartoum. While the grounds for such support varied from one country to the other, it was often aimed primarily at weakening the GoS. Similarly, Sudan’s stand in the internal affairs of its neighbours has complicated relations. [xii]

Uganda has been a long time sponsor of the SPLM/A. Sudan on the other hand has supported the Lord’s Resistance Army in its violent campaign, ostensibly aimed at government policies in Northern Uganda. Uganda intensified its support for the SPLM/A in the mid 1990s which finally caused a breakdown in diplomatic relations between the two countries. However, in 1999 both countries pledged to cease supporting rebel groups. Both Sudan and Uganda felt that working together served their mutual interests. Sudan used Uganda to pressure the SPLM/A into a cease-fire, while Uganda was allowed to undertake limited military operations against the LRA on Sudanese territory. In 2003 the countries re-established full diplomatic relations. Uganda and the GoS have welcomed the 2006 initiative of the Government of Southern Sudan to mediate between the LRA and the Government of Uganda. [xiii]

Sudan’s relationship with Ethiopia has been equally difficult. Ethiopia’s consistent support to the SPLM/A, and Sudan’s backing of Eritrean separatists and rebels in northern Ethiopia complicated relations between the two countries. Ethiopia has consistently been also supporting the SPLM/A since its inception. After the regime change in Ethiopia in 1991, supported by Khartoum, the Ethiopian government ended its support to the SPLM/A.[xiv] However, the alleged involvement of Sudan in the 1995 attempted murder on Egyptian president Mubarak created yet another break in diplomatic relations between the two countries. Ethiopia resumed supporting the SPLM/A while Sudan backed different groups that opposed the Ethiopian government. Forced to rethink its priorities due to its war against Eritrea in 1998, Ethiopia ended its public support for the SPLM/A, and eventually normalized its relations with Sudan. At present, both countries claim to maintain strong ties.

Initially warm relations between Sudan and Eritrea during the first few years of Eritrea’s independence soured after Eritrea joined other nations in accusing Sudan of backing the Islamic Jihad.[xv] Eritrea soon joined Ethiopia and Uganda as one of the so called ‘frontline states’, backed by the US, and started its support to different Sudanese opposition groups including the SPLM/A. Sudan on its part supported Eritrean opposition groups, which was interrupted by the outbreak of the war with Ethiopia. In 2000 the two countries resumed diplomatic ties, which broke down again three years later when Sudan closed its borders with Eritrea amidst accusations that Eritrea was arming the Eastern Front rebels in eastern Sudan. In 2006, Eritrea brokered the Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement (ESPA) between the government of Sudan
and the rebels in the east, made possible by the general reconciliation between the governments of Sudan and Eritrea.

Sudan’s relation with Egypt is shaped by three factors. These are the use of the Nile, border disputes and Sudan’s alleged involvement in the murder attempt on Egyptian president Mubarak in 1995. Although each issue is potentially explosive, the two countries have managed to contain the situation and normalize their diplomatic relations. Regarding the Nile, the two countries have an agreement which allocates a certain percentage of the water to be used by each country. The border dispute has led to serious confrontation between the two countries in 1995. [xvi] Currently the disputed territory, Halaib, is administered by Egypt. Although Sudan’s involvement in the attempt on the life of Egyptian president rocked their relations, the two countries have been able to mend their relations. Nonetheless, Egypt’s attempts to mediate in the southern conflict have by and large been welcomed by Sudan, notably the Egyptian-Libyan Initiative that for a while rivaled the IGAD peace process, and the negotiations between the government and the DUP-led NDA that culminated in the Cairo Agreement in June 2005.[xvii]

Kenya has dominated the IGAD peace processes for Sudan, and has hosted significant numbers of refugees from the conflict in Southern Sudan. It has retained good relations with both the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A.

During the Cold War, Sudan was commonly seen as an ally of the United States of America. However, relations declined rapidly in the 1990s, especially when the Clinton administration responded aggressively to Khartoum’s hosting of Osama bin Laden. Despite the departure of bin Laden from Sudan in 1996, relations between the US and Sudan continued to deteriorate as the US imposed further sanctions on Sudan products and assets. Following the deadly attacks on US embassies in Kenya and Tanzania by al Qaida the US launched a missile attack on a pharmaceutical factory in Khartoum suspected of manufacturing nerve gas. The evidence for the attack was later proven to be dubious. [xviii]

Meanwhile, the US Congress became increasingly involved in the cause of the SPLM/A as Garang’s calls for a secular democracy resonated with Washington. With President Bush’s policy of engagement, the US became a force behind the rejuvenated peace process, in particular after John Danforth was appointed as a Special Envoy for Peace in Sudan in 2001. Concluding that the war was unwinnable, he recommended confidence-building measures by the two main protagonists known as the ‘Danforth tests’: a ceasefire in the Nuba Mountains; agreement on zones of tranquility for humanitarian access; an end to attacks on civilians; and the establishment of a commission on slavery and abduction. [xix]

While the White House and State Department have sought engagement with Khartoum in exchange for cooperation in the ‘war on terror,’ a number of Christian lobby groups in the US continued to call for pressure on Khartoum. In 2002, Congress passed the Sudan Peace Act providing massive aid deliveries for southern Sudan and imposing sanctions on the GoS if it failed to negotiate in good faith with the SPLM/A.

The US-Sudan rapprochement following the signing of the CPA quickly soured due to GoS’ disappointment with a perceived failure by the US to publicly credit it for the successful conclusion of the CPA process and its cooperation in the ‘war on terror’. Furthermore, the window of opportunity that appeared when the CPA was signed on 9 January 2005, was quickly shut by the devastating conflict in Darfur. [xx]

**Darfur**

**United Nations**

**Early humanitarian relief efforts**
The early stages of the Darfur conflict unfolded largely without notice by the outside world. The effects of the civil war were noticeable by the summer of 2003, however, as the number of refugees arriving in Chad reached roughly 70,000 and the few active NGOs inside Darfur put the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) at over 400,000. The humanitarian appeals went out and resources began to arrive, slowly. The help that did arrive was initially focussed on those who were able to escape to Chad because the GoS was blocking most aid from reaching those in need within its borders. Apparently, the GoS was not interested in the additional scrutiny that would come with an influx of international aid workers and was prepared to go to considerable lengths to either block or tightly control the flow of aid to that end.144

Once the UN became involved in a political sense in the spring of 2004, then Secretary-General, Kofi Annan placed a high priority on the humanitarian access issue in his public statements and his eventual direct talks with the GoS in July, 2004. These talks led to the signing of a Joint Communiqué on 3 July that, inter alia, committed the GoS to easing access for humanitarian workers and supplies. This commitment was pursued by Annan_s Special Representative, Jan Pronk, upon his arrival in Khartoum the following month and progress was made, slowly, on the question of humanitarian access over the coming months. Though the improvements were always viewed as too modest and slow by the UN and NGOs, the Secretary-General was able to report to the Security Council at the end of August that the GoS was allowing more aid workers into Darfur, but that government policies still hindered some movement of aid workers and their supplies.145 This pattern of incomplete compliance on humanitarian issues persists today.

**Political Engagement**

As Darfur lurched towards civil war, the GoS and SPLM/A were in the process of negotiating an end to their long civil war through the Naivasha talks in Kenya. In anticipation of assisting in the implementation of any agreement, the UN decided in June 2004 to deploy an advanced mission to Sudan to lay the groundwork for a multidimensional peace support operation (SCR 1547, 11 June 2004). The focus of the United Nations Advanced Mission in Sudan (UNAMIS) was to be on the North-South peace process as the Security Council_s members at first chose to prioritise the North-South process over the unfolding crisis in Darfur. The Council likely made this decision with two reasons in mind: 1) so as not to threaten the prospects of a North-South deal by distracting diplomatic focus away from the Naivasha talks or applying unwanted pressure on GoS; and, 2) there was a hope in diplomatic circles that any eventual North-South deal would serve as a model settlement for Darfur.146

By the time the UNAMIS leadership team arrived in Sudan in August 2004, the Council_s posture had shifted and it began to address the Darfur crisis directly by mandating the Secretary-General (in SCR 1556, 30 July 2004) to engage humanitarian issues, improve independent investigations of violations of human rights and international humanitarian law, begin contingency planning for greater UN involvement in Darfur, report on the GoS efforts to implement the Joint Communiqué and provide support and assistance to the African Union as it prepared to take on its monitoring role of the Humanitarian Cease-fire Agreement of April 2004.147 These functions were continued by the unified, multidimensional operation

---

144 For an overview of the problems encountered in getting the humanitarian relief efforts on the ground see, Gerard Prunier, Darfur: the Ambiguous Genocide, Cornell University Press, 2005, p. 130-8.
146 For more on the perceived relationships between the Naivasha talks and the Darfur Crisis, see Human Rights Watch, Darfur: Whose Responsibility to Protect?, Human Rights Watch, New York, January 2005, p. 4-5., and United Nations, Progress Report of the Secretary General on the Sudan pursuant to paragraph 7 of the Security Council Resolution 1547, paragraph 35.
that took over from the advanced mission in March 2005, the UN Mission in Sudan, or UNMIS (SCR 1590, 24 March 2005).

This largely humanitarian focus in activity was complemented by a supporting role in the political negotiations process that was led by the African Union and centred in the Nigerian capital city, Abuja. This Abuja process would continue, with the UN as an observer, until May 2006 and the signing of the Darfur Peace Agreement. While this political process played out, however, it became increasingly clear that the AU observer force on the ground in Darfur was not sufficient to monitor the existing agreements or protect civilians. Talks began in late 2005 between the UN and AU on enhanced cooperation and support for the AU mission while laying the groundwork for an eventual transition to a UN force in Darfur.148

Khartoum's firm opposition to a UN force prompted months of difficult negotiations between the UN, AU, various concerned foreign governments and Khartoum.149 As these talks continued throughout most of 2006, the UN and the AU devised a support package that could be deployed in stages to serve the AU force while, at the same time, building a more robust foundation from which a future UN force could later deploy.150 Khartoum's opposition to a purely UN mission never diminished, however, and this compelled the UN and AU to plan and deploy a first-ever fully integrated 'hybrid' operation jointly managed by both organisations. The hybrid force was authorised by the UN Security Council on 31 July 2007 (SCR 1769) with a wide-ranging mandate (see UNAMID Profile) and is slowly deploying to the field.

**African Union**

The African Union has been directly involved on the ground in Darfur since the summer of 2004 when it deployed a small observer and monitoring mission as per the terms of the Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement (HCFA) signed between the GoS and rebels in April 2004. A protocol signed the following month between the AU and the parties to the conflict established the terms of an oversight and decision-making body, the Joint Commission, a Ceasefire Commission (CFC) tasked to monitor the implementation of the HCFA and the CFC's operational arm, an AU monitoring mission.

Shortly after deploying the monitoring mission, the AU's Peace and Security Council requested that the mission be up-graded to a more robust peacekeeping operation.151 The plan to transform the AU Mission in Sudan (AMIS) from a small observer mission to a larger peacekeeping force was presented to the PSC in October 2004 and called for a force increase from 465 personnel (military and civilian) to 3,320. However, the mandate of the mission remained largely unchanged but with a higher profile among the parties and the civilian population.152

In April 2005, AMIS was increased again to over 7,700 personnel (military, police and civilian) and given a broader mandate to protect civilians and humanitarian relief operations.153 The new resources for AMIS were deployed throughout 2005 and 2006. Yet, even as this larger mission with an enhanced mandate for protecting civilians took shape, calls only increased that it be replaced by a (presumably) more effective

---

148 The planning process for a transition to a UN force was publically mandated in UN Security Council Resolution 1663, 24 March 2006, paragraph 6.
149 See, for example, Associated Press ‘Sudan’s President rejects UN Peacekeepers in Darfur’, the Globe and Mail, 20 June 2006.
150 For the full range of proposed support package, see United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General on Darfur, S/2006/591, 28 July 2006, paragraph 40-60.
152 See African Union, Report of the Chairperson of the Commission on the Situation in Darfur, the Sudan, 20 October 2004, PSC/PR/2(XVII)
UN or NATO force. As the critics argued, even with the larger force, AMIS did not have the sufficient number of soldiers, logistics, hardware, communications, planning capacity or mandate to protect civilians (either still in villages or in the many IDP camps) or monitor violations of the various agreements between the parties in such a large area. As the GoS effectively blocked the transition to a UN force, the AU and UN devised a plan for a hybrid force to take over from AMIS. The AU PSC endorsed this plan in a communiqué on 30 November 2006. The hybrid force was approved by the UN in July 2007 (see above) and it is currently in a long start-up phase.

In addition to deploying and managing AMIS, the AU also had a leading role on the diplomatic track in trying to find a solution to the Darfur crisis. Beginning in late 2004, the AU was the lead mediator in the peace process and centred its efforts on the Abuja process. After almost two years of off-again, on-again negotiations, the Abuja process concluded with the signing of the Darfur Peace Agreement on May, 2006. This is a less-than-successful conclusion, however, because only one of the rebel actions signed the agreement with the others returning to the battlefield. More details below.

Non-Governmental Organisations

As noted above, the international community’s early engagement with the Darfur crisis was largely through the humanitarian relief efforts. But, at the time the crisis broke, there were very few international or national non-governmental organisations’ (NGOs) staff operating in Darfur. The Darfur Humanitarian Profile for May 2004 reported that there were only 128 international aid workers and 972 national staff for a total IDP population alone of over 1.1 million and an estimated affected population of 2 million. The resulting ration of international aid staff to IDPs alone was 1 to 8,500 and national staff to IDPs was 1 to 1,500. These numbers were far too low to provide effective assistance to such a large population and would be overwhelmed if the numbers of IDPs (to say nothing of people in need of help who could not reach an IDP camp) increased if the conflict continued to spread.

The official reaction from Khartoum was to downplay the humanitarian urgency and present obstacles for NGOs and UN agencies seeking to increase operations in Darfur. Nonetheless, a combination of international pressure and negotiations led to a relaxing of the constraining rules on humanitarian action. Although GoS continued to be less than cooperative in a number of respects, humanitarian access to affected populations increased greatly through late 2004 and by mid 2005, the humanitarian operation in Darfur was the largest in the world with some 11,500 aid workers deployed.

Sadly, the lack of progress on the political/military tracks means that the large-scale civilian suffering that characterised the Darfur conflict in 2004 continues today. By early March 2009, the estimated population of displaced Darfurians had reached 2.7 million and another 4.7 million people were ‘affected’ by the conflict and in need of some form of assistance. To meet these ever-increasing humanitarian needs, the number of aid workers (national and international) was roughly 14,700 through 80 some NGOs, the Red Cross Movement and 14 UN agencies by 2008. While the numbers of aid workers has increased dramatically since 2004, serious complaints persist that humanitarian access is still constrained or blocked.

154 See, for example, ICG, The AU’s Mission in Darfur: Bridging the Gaps, Africa Briefing No. 28, 6 July 2005.
157 For an overview of the kinds of tactics employed by the GoS to stymie the humanitarian response see, Prunier, p. 130-8.
159 These figures can be found at OCHA, Sudan Humanitarian Snapshot, March 2009.
by GoS. The UN and GoS signed another joint communiqué in March 2007 on humanitarian access.\textsuperscript{161} UN reports from the field, however, suggest that not all of the communiqué’s provisions are being implemented.\textsuperscript{162} After the decision by the International Criminal Court to issue an arrest warrant for Sudan’s President al-Bashir on 4 March 2009, however, the question of humanitarian access took on much more urgency as GoS took steps to expel 13 international aid groups from Darfur. After this announcement, GoS went further the following day by declaring its intent to have all international NGOs out of Darfur within a year and their delivery responsibilities taken over by Sudanese officials or Sudanese NGOs.\textsuperscript{163}

The UN and remaining humanitarian organizations quickly redrew aid plans after the NGOs were expelled. According to the UN, the areas most at risk are sanitation, shelter, and health services. Stop-gap measures were put in place that allowed for the distribution of food to 1.1 million people and the expansion of water and health services through April. While these efforts may help in the short-term, there is the potential for serious long-term effect on Darfur’s food supply. Because of a lack of resources, twenty percent fewer cattle were vaccinated and farmers received substantially less seeds and tools.\textsuperscript{164} Attacks and abductions have further complicated humanitarian work for NGOs that remain in Darfur. Two hundred-fifty aid workers from ICC signing nations have been attacked since the ICC issued its arrest warrant. On November 22, two French Red Cross workers were kidnapped in Western Darfur and in Eastern Chad and have yet to be returned. As a result, the ICRC suspended its work in those areas. Attacks, banditry, and harassment have forced many international organizations to curtail their humanitarian work.\textsuperscript{165} Sudan has since softened its stand on international NGOs after pressure from the United States and the Arab League. Four American aid groups were allowed to re-enter Sudan provided they adopted new names and sent new foreign personnel.\textsuperscript{166}

### Key governments

**Chad** the role of Chad has changed dramatically since the outset of the rebellion in Darfur, and one must understand the history to understand how things have evolved. Chad and Sudan have been intrinsically linked throughout history as many of the tribes of this region have never recognized the international boundary as dividing their territories. President Idriss Déby is a Zaghawa as are many of the Darfur rebels. The Zaghawa tribe spans the region. This reality has entangled Sudan and Chad in frequent conflicts over land and power. Many of the Arab militia fighting in Darfur are of Chadian origin, and many of the rebels similarly served in the Chadian army or militia. President Déby entered office in Chad with the support of the Sudanese government by overthrowing his predecessor, Hissène Habré in 1990. He launched his offensive from Darfur. This support included an agreement of both governments to refrain


\textsuperscript{162} United Nations, Darfur Humanitarian Profile, No. 30, paragraph 7.

\textsuperscript{163} See, “Sudan’s Bashir orders foreign relief groups out within a year,” Sudan Tribune, 17 March 2009.


\textsuperscript{166} “US Senator Kerry Says Sudan Will Accept New Aid Groups,” Sudan Tribune April 17.
from supporting rebel forces against each other’s regimes. Déby initially honoured this agreement, to the extent that he was called upon to mediate the early ceasefire agreements in Abéché, September 2003 and N’Djamena, April 2004. However the pressure from his Zaghawa kinsmen overcame his ability to deny them assistance. Déby’s support to the Sudanese rebel forces provoked the government of Sudan into backing the Chadian rebels’ efforts to overthrow Déby, thus creating a proxy war between the two countries. Déby declared a state of war between Sudan and Chad after rebels launched an attack from Sudan against Adre, Chad in December 2005. The tensions and current conflict between the two countries continue to undermine peace efforts in Darfur. The UN approved the creation of EUFOR-CHAD/CAR. This mission came to an end in mid January 2009 and the UN Security Council authorised MINURCAT to assume EUFOR’s mandate in Chad and CAR.167

On 3 May, Sudan and Chad signed a “Good Neighbours Agreement” in Doha. The two countries agreed to discontinue their support of armed opposition groups in the other’s territory and recommitted to deploying an independent border observation and protection force. Initially, the agreement did little to stop cross-border incursions by the Chadian military and Sudanese rebel groups. By June, the UN reported a decrease in violence on the border although armed groups continued to remain on high alert.168

**Libya**, in the course of the Darfur rebellion has consistently made overtures to the parties and initiated peace conferences. The Darfur Form, consisting of traditional leaders from Darfur met on numerous occasions with Col. Gaddafi in order to include them in formal peace negotiations as representatives of Darfurian civil society. The most recent talks were held in Sirte, Libya in October 2007, but failed to achieve any significant progress as many of the non-signatory rebel groups refused to attend.169

**Eritrea**, like Chad, maintains an ambiguous relationship with the NCP, as an eastern neighbour to Sudan and one that also has experience with proxy wars. Eritrea has supported the Darfur rebels, as well as the Eastern Front for many years. It has provided military training within its own territory, support for the rebel movements to negotiate peace and it has also hosted international meetings geared at achieving peace in Darfur. Although until recently Eritrea has been active in its support to the Darfur rebels it did mediate the peace agreements between the GoS and the Eastern Front and agree that it would not support rebels on its border.

**Egypt**, as a member of the Arab League, has declared its support for peace in Darfur. It has hosted the NDA meetings and made visits to Darfur. However, many Darfurians express strong antipathy towards the Egyptians as they are perceived as allied to the Sudan government and have supported Arab militias in Darfur.170

The USA has staked out an evolving position on the Darfur crisis since 2003. During the first year of the crisis, the Bush administration focused its Sudan policy on securing a peace agreement between the GoS and SPLM/A. As Darfur grabbed more international attention in 2004, however, Washington became more vocal on finding a peaceful solution and began supporting the fledging AU mission. In September 2004, Secretary of State, Colin Powell, testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee that the conflict in Darfur was genocide but that the US government was of the view that this conclusion did not warrant

---

170 For an overview of the French role in Chad, and recent changes to that role see, Scott Baldauf, ‘As Fighting Rages in Chad, France’s New Role Revealed’, *Christian Science Monitor*, 5 February 2008.
any addition action. When the US government decided that GoS was not implementing its obligations reached with the UN, Washington pushed at the UN Security Council for sanctions against GoS and its Janjaweed militia, which led to SCR 1556 on 31 July 2004. In March 2005, the USA abstained on the resolution that referred war crimes cases to the International Criminal Court, thereby allowing the resolution to pass and give the ICC a major role in the crisis, against well-established Bush administration policy (SCR 1593, 31 March 2005). While providing substantial support to the operations of AMIS, Washington also took on a significant role in the AU-led Abuja process which led to the controversial signing of the DPA in May 2006. Critics, however, argued that the Bush administration should have and could have done more on the Darfur crisis but the administration resisted such calls.

US policy has been motivated and influenced by a number of different and, possibly, competing factors. In the first instance, Sudan has been under US economic sanctions since the late 1990s over US concerns that Sudan was a supporter of international terrorism directed against US interests. These sanctions remain in place today and have been augmented by the more recent Darfur-specific sanctions, but the Khartoum-Washington relationship evolved somewhat after the terror attacks of September 2001 in that Khartoum sought to cooperate with Washington on terror related intelligence. The CIA took some steps to establish this relationship after the eruption of the Darfur crisis but without the full support of other US departments. The administration has also had to contend with an interested and animated Congress when it comes to Sudan issues. Many members of Congress have long supported the SPLM/A’s cause and, as a result, there was an existing group of US politicians suspicious of the GoS and prepared to take up the Darfur cause when it appeared on Washington radar in 2004. Congress pronounced the Darfur conflict to be genocide roughly six-weeks before Powell did on behalf of the administration. Finally, a large civil society movement demanding more action on Darfur took shape in the USA soon after the crisis became widely known (see below for more details).

The incoming Obama administration appears to bring with it a number of senior officials who have staked out very hard positions on Darfur that are critical of GoS and call for more forceful action to stop the fighting and abuses in Darfur. The new administration, however, adopted a softer and more conciliatory approach in its Sudan strategy with incentives to normalize relations with the Northern government and al-Bashir. The strategy also offers clear disincentives should the government interfere with fair elections and the upcoming referendum on Southern Sudan’s independence. The shift in US policy and the shift within the Obama administration itself can be attributed to the new envoy to Sudan, Scott Gration. Gration favours a softer approach. He testified before Congress and called for the removal of Sudan from the United States’ list of state sponsors of terrorism and argued that economic sanctions were turning the Sudanese people against the US. Obama’s strategy and his new envoy have been criticized by congressmen and in the media as too soft on Khartoum.

171 Powell’s determination was based, in large part, on a study conducted by the Coalition for International Justice. The report and Powell’s statement to the Senate committee can both be found at

172 The Bush administration continued to defend its record on Darfur into its final days in office. See, for example, Dan Eggen, ‘White House Defends its Peace Efforts in Darfur’, Washington Post, 6 January 2009.

173 For examples of the critical assessment of US policy on Darfur, see the collected works of Professor Eric Reeves or NYT columnist Nicholas Kristof.

174 See, for example, Scott Shane, ‘CIA Role in Visit of Sudan Intelligence Chief Causes Dispute within Administration’, The New York Times, 18 June 2005.

175 Congress passed concurrent resolutions declaring the Darfur conflict to be genocide on 22 July 2004 (H. Con Res. 467 and S. Con. Res. 113).

176 For example, see, Mathew Lee, ‘Darfur Groups Pin High Hopes on Obama Team’, Associated Press, 12 December 2008.

China and Russia are often characterised as the protectors of GoS in the UN Security Council. China has come under the greatest scrutiny as a result of its large investments in the growing Sudanese oil sector and as a provider of arms to the GoS.\textsuperscript{179} But, Chinese policy on Darfur is also informed by its long-standing opposition to international interference in the domestic matters of states. Because of these positions, however, Beijing has come in for sustained public criticism in many western countries. Over the past three years, there have been slight changes to Beijing’s non-interference position on Darfur, perhaps out of concern that the Beijing 2008 Summer Olympics would be overshadowed by persistent accusations of complicity in the conflict. These modest shifts have been credited in some quarters of convincing GoS to reverse its firm position opposing the AU-UN hybrid peace operation.\textsuperscript{180} But, Chinese support for GoS remains firm over important issues like the ICC, as demonstrated by China’s reported rejection of a draft Security Council Presidential statement that criticized Khartoum’s decision to expel NGOs and called on it to reverse the decision.\textsuperscript{181}

In the case of Russia, commercial interests also seem to exert an influence over that country’s position on Darfur. Russia has maintained relations with Khartoum throughout the crisis and has opposed sweeping sanctions and other punitive measures against GoS.\textsuperscript{182} Russia’s economic interests appear to be based on prospects for arms sales and military servicing contracts. According to Amnesty International, arms transfers from Russia (China and others) continued even after SCR 1556 was adopted putting a partial arms embargo on Darfur.\textsuperscript{183} Also in parallel with China, the Russian government is a defender of national sovereignty and not likely to endorse forceful intervention measures.

The Darfur Movement

As neither international diplomatic nor political action has been sufficient to stop the war in Darfur, civil society actors have embarked upon their own movement of global advocacy to pressure governments to respond accordingly and put an end to the Darfur crisis. Some of these organizations uphold the US position that genocide is occurring in Darfur, and the international community has a responsibility to act. Others support the doctrine of ‘Responsibility to Protect’ and demand stronger action from the UNSC and governments of the world. Two such organizations are identified below.\textsuperscript{184}

The Save Darfur Coalition is an alliance of more than 180 faith-based, advocacy, and human rights organizations that raises public awareness about the perceived genocide in Darfur and mobilizes a


\textsuperscript{180} See, Jim Yardley, ‘Chinese envoy to Sudan defends policy on Darfur’, International Herald Tribune, 7 March 2008.

\textsuperscript{181} See ‘Sudan’s Bashir orders foreign relief groups out within a year’, Sudan Tribune, op. cit.,

\textsuperscript{182} The Russian position has been rather consistent. See, Scott Peterson, ‘Sudan’s key ties at the UN’, Christian Science Monitor, 31 August 2004 and Gethin Chamberlain and Denise Driscoll, ‘UK, US have to accept the can’t force Sudan over Darfur Russia’, Sudan Tribune, 4 June 2007.

\textsuperscript{183} See, Amnesty International, Sudan: A rms continuing to fuel serious human rights abuses in Darfur, May 2007. For more on Russia’s explicit desires to increase arms sales to Sudan and Africa as a whole, see, Reuters, ‘Russia opposes sanctions against Sudan, eyes arms sales’, Sudan Tribune, 20 September 2004.

\textsuperscript{184} For a broad overview of the development of the civil society movement concerned with Darfur in the USA, see, Rebecca Hamilton and Chad Hazlett, ‘Not on our Watch: The Emergence of the American Movement for Darfur’, in, War in Darfur and the Search for Peace, ed. Alex de Waal, Harvard University Press, Boston, 2007.
response to the atrocities that threaten the lives of people throughout the Darfur region. It is estimated that the coalition's member organizations represent 130 million people united to help the people of Darfur. (www.SaveDarfur.org)

The ENOUGH Project comes out of the Center for American Progress to end genocide and crimes against humanity. With an initial focus on the crises in Darfur, Chad, eastern Congo, and northern Uganda, ENOUGH_s strategy papers and briefings provide sharp field analysis and targeted policy recommendations based on a '3P' crisis response strategy: promoting durable peace, providing civilian protection, and punishing perpetrators of atrocities. ENOUGH works with concerned citizens, advocates, and policy makers to prevent, mitigate, and resolve these crises. (www.enoughproject.org)
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UNAMID Mandate


In their joint report of 22 June 2007, the Chairperson of the AU Commission and the UN Secretary-General proposed a wide-ranging mandate for a hybrid AU-UN mission for Darfur in an effort to overcome GoS objections to a purely UN force supplanting AMIS. Through Security Council Resolution 1769 of 31 July 2007, the UN endorsed the proposed mandate as written in the joint report thereby establishing UNAMID and entrusting it with eight over-arching objectives:

(a) To contribute to the restoration of necessary security conditions for the safe provision of humanitarian assistance and to facilitate full humanitarian access throughout Darfur;

(b) To contribute to the protection of civilian populations under imminent threat of physical violence and prevent attacks against civilians, within its capability and areas of deployment, without prejudice to the responsibility of the Government of the Sudan (authorised under Chapter VII of the UN Charter);

(c) To monitor, observe compliance with and verify the implementation of various ceasefire agreements signed since 2004, as well as assist with the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement and any subsequent agreements;

(d) To assist the political process in order to ensure that it is inclusive, and to support the African Union-United Nations joint mediation in its efforts to broaden and deepen commitment to the peace process;

(e) To contribute to a secure environment for economic reconstruction and development, as well as the sustainable return of internally displaced persons and refugees to their homes;

(f) To contribute to the promotion of respect for and protection of human rights and fundamental freedoms in Darfur;

(g) To assist in the promotion of the rule of law in Darfur, including through support for strengthening an independent judiciary and the prison system, and assistance in the development and consolidation of the legal framework, in consultation with relevant Sudanese authorities;

(h) To monitor and report on the security situation at the Sudan's borders with Chad and the Central African Republic.

The Security Council also endorsed the joint report's recommendation that the new hybrid mission should be given specific tasks in four areas as a way to increase the mission's effectiveness and chances for success. The following are examples from each of the four areas:

(a) Support for the peace process and good offices:

(i) To support the good offices of the African Union-United Nations Joint Special Representative for Darfur and the mediation efforts of the Special Envoy of the African Union and the United Nations;

(ii) To support and monitor the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement and subsequent agreements;

(iii) To facilitate the preparation and conduct of the Darfur-Darfur Dialogue and Consultation, as stipulated in the Darfur Peace Agreement.

(b) Security:

(i) To promote the re-establishment of confidence, deter violence and assist in monitoring and verifying the implementation of the redeployment and disengagement provisions of the Darfur Peace Agreement, including by actively providing security and robust patrolling of redeployment and buffer zones, by monitoring the withdrawal of long-range weapons, and by deploying hybrid police, including formed police units, in areas where internally displaced persons are concentrated, in the demilitarized and buffer zones, along key routes of migration and in other vital areas, including as provided for in the Darfur Peace Agreement (authorised under Chapter VII of the UN Charter);

(ii) To monitor, investigate, report and assist the parties in resolving violations of the Darfur Peace Agreement and subsequent complementary agreements through the Ceasefire Commission and the Joint Commission;

(iii) To monitor, verify and promote efforts to disarm the Janjaweed and other militias;

(iv) In the areas of deployment of its forces and within its capabilities, to protect the hybrid operation's personnel, facilities, installations and equipment, to ensure the security and freedom of movement of United Nations-African Union personnel, humanitarian workers and Assessment and Evaluation Commission personnel, to prevent disruption of the implementation of the Darfur Peace Agreement by armed groups and, without prejudice to the responsibility of the Government of the Sudan, to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence and prevent attacks and threats against civilians;

(c) Rule of law, governance, and human rights:
(i) To assist all stakeholders and local government authorities, in particular in their efforts to transfer resources in an equitable manner from the federal Government to the Darfur states, and to implement reconstruction plans and existing and subsequent agreements on land use and compensation issues;

(ii) To assist in promoting the rule of law, including through institution-building, and strengthening local capacities to combat impunity;

(iii) To ensure an adequate human rights and gender presence capacity, and expertise in Darfur in order to contribute to efforts to protect and promote human rights in Darfur, with particular attention to vulnerable groups;

(iv) To assist in harnessing the capacity of women to participate in the peace process, including through political representation, economic empowerment and protection from gender-based violence;

(d) Humanitarian assistance:

(i) To facilitate the effective provision of humanitarian assistance and full access to people in need.

Assessment of UNAMID mandate

As Refugees International (RI) noted, the passage of Resolution 1769 may be a decisive step towards protecting the vulnerable people of Darfur, but its language is deliberately vague on the force’s actual mandate to do so. RI sees the main reason for this vagueness in the nature of multilateral decision-making in the Security Council, which is based on the need for consensus-building, and concludes that ‘the sovereignty of a state that has failed dismally to protect its own population has trumped international morality.’

Regardless of the potential shortcomings of Resolution 1769, the real issue is whether or not UNAMID’s Force Commander, Lieutenant General Patrick Nyamvumba, and the Troop Contributing Countries are willing to risk the lives of their soldiers and police officers in order to prevent or stop killing and to end the gross abuses of human rights in Darfur. In this vein, it is worth noting that by October 2009, 48 UNAMID staff members had been killed, some in deliberate attacks, yet patrols and the deployment continue.186

In his analysis of various options available to UNAMID’s force commander, Alex de Waal recommended avoiding what he called ‘garrison peacekeeping’ (i.e. treating Darfur as a hostile territory in which UN troops are continually under threat, and mount patrols only in a state of combat readiness with full armour). Instead, he suggested that UNAMID should use a ‘community peacekeeping’ approach, i.e. treating Darfur’s communities as allies in a concerted attempt to stabilize the region. As he explains, this would entail posting a community liaison officer in every single chief’s court or town market, with the aim of gaining the confidence of the community leaders, finding out what are their problems, assisting in solving those problems, and identifying any looming clashes so that pre-emptive action can be taken. Based on recent UN reports, it appears that UNAMID is using some of these tactics in its daily operations.187

For an updated assessment of UNAMID’s performance, see UNAMID Issues.

---

UNAMID Command/Coordination Mechanisms

In light of the complexities of the conflict, the (ever-changing) number of parties to the conflict, the reluctant cooperation from GoS, the untried and untested hybrid mission structure, the presence of UNMIS in the same country, the world’s largest humanitarian effort in the same theatre and critical trans-border issues that come under the purview of UNAMID and a different mission on the Chad and CAR sides of the borders, effective command and coordination mechanisms will be central elements to UNAMID’s eventual success.

Intra-UNAMID: The AU and UN agreed in November 2006 that any hybrid mission would be led by a ‘Joint Special Representative’ (JSR) of the AU Chairperson and the UN Secretary-General (SG). The JSR is appointed by, and reports to, the Chairperson and the SG. The JSR is entrusted with overall authority for the mission, its management and implementing its mandate.

The Force Commander (FC), the Police Commissioner (PC) and their respective deputies are appointed by the AU Chairperson in consultation with the SG. Both the Commander and the Commissioner report to the JSR. Operational orders are transmitted through an integrated mission headquarters that includes coordinating units such as the Joint Operations Centre and the Joint Logistics Operating Centre.

AU-UN Coordination: The two organisations will provide coordinated support to UNAMID through the Joint Support and Coordination Mechanism (JSCM) based in Addis Ababa. The JSCM is staffed by a dedicated team of liaison officers tasked to backstop UNAMID with operational and planning support.

Inter-UNAMID and other missions: Although UNAMID is a distinct mission, it will maintain close ties with both UNMIS and the AU Liaison Office for the implementation of the CPA with the view to ensuring that the implementation processes of the DPA and the CPA proceed in mutually-reinforcing ways and to ensure continued logistical support from the UN.

Coordination and communications with the DSRSG/RC/HC of UNMIS will be particularly important as the humanitarian effort in Darfur will remain under the purview of the DSRSG/RC/HC of UNMIS and will not be part of UNAMID. UNAMID will not have any direct responsibility for the work of the UN and non-UN relief agencies working in Darfur save for the above-mentioned mandated task to 'facilitate the effective provision of humanitarian assistance and full access to people in need.'

UNAMID will coordinate closely with the AU and UN Joint Chief Mediator for Darfur as he pursues the political process that will hopefully end the Darfur conflict. Standing liaison arrangements will be established and maintained within the Joint Mediation Support Team that already works in the service of the Joint Chief Mediator.

UNAMID has been tasked to establish 'civilian-military liaison offices' in both of the newly expanding mission in Chad and CAR (MINURCAT) but, at the time of writing, it is not clear what progress has been made. Of course, given the importance of cross-border issues for UNAMID, these offices must be established on an urgent basis and function effectively.

Inter-UNAMID and the Parties: In the first instance, UNAMID will interact with the parties through its monitoring, verifying and reporting role for the Ceasefire Commission and the Joint Commission, which have been in place since the Humanitarian Ceasefire Agreement that was signed in April 2004.

Outside of this forum, the JSR will work with the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the rebel leadership.
At the operational level, UNAMID will engage through a number of thematic or operational issues. For example, the police component will represent UNAMID on the Darfur Security Arrangements Implementation Commission as a means to encouraging police reform. Also, the Tripartite Committee on Deployment issues has been meeting since 7 October 2008 to bring together GNU, the AU and UN to discuss and solve UNAMID deployment problems, challenges and concerns.

UNAMID will coordinate with Darfuri civil society groups through the Darfur-Darfur Dialogue and Consultation, plus institutions created through the DPA, such as the Transitional Darfur Service Commission.

**Challenges:** Coordination between UNAMID and the parties, as is always the case, will be as effective as the parties want it to be. While UNAMID will have limited influence over the attitudes of the parties, it will still need to ensure that it is properly organised internally so that it is an effective and motivated interlocutor for the parties through all points and mechanisms of contact and coordination.

Of more specific concern will be the establishment and maintenance of the mechanisms intended to increase coordination between the AU and UN, and between UNAMID and other missions, such as UNMIS and MINURCAT. As noted above, the arrangements have been mandated and established, in some cases, but, it is not clear how effective they will be in promoting joint or coordinated action. At this point in UNAMID’s deployment, there is reason to think that these various mechanisms will remain nothing more than information-sharing arrangements, not platforms for joint or coordinated decision-making.

**UNAMID Composition**

**Functional Components**

*Military:* The largest component of UNAMID will be the military component with its authorised force strength of 19,555. As of 31 October 2009, the military component had reached 14,803 personnel, plus 207 military observers.

*Police:* The Police Component is authorised to reach a maximum number of 6,432 police officers. As of 31 October 2009, the number was at 4,280.

*Non-uniformed components* represent the balance of the mission structure and personnel levels. As of 28 February 2009, there were 1,053 non-uniformed international and 2,357 national civilian staff members in UNAMID. This number will rise as the mission continues to deploy, with the authorised limit at 5,569.188

The non-uniformed civilian staff will fill the following components:

- Office of the JSR
- Office of the DJSR
- Political Affairs
- Civil Affairs
- Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR)
- Human Rights
- Rule of Law

---

• Humanitarian Liaison
• Child Protection
• Gender
• HIV/AIDS support
• Mine Action
• Public Information
• Safety and Security
• Conduct
• Mission Support

**Strength**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength as of 31 October 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15,115 total uniformed personnel, including 14,803 troops, 207 military observers, 4,280 police officers, supported by 1,053 international civilian personnel, 2,357 local civilian staff and 390 United Nations Volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Contributors of military personnel**

Bangladesh, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Egypt, Ethiopia, Gambia, Germany, Guatemala, Indonesia, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Thailand, Togo, Turkey, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

**Contributors of police personnel**

Bangladesh, Burundi, Cameroon, China, Côte d'Ivoire, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, France, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Indonesia, Jamaica, Jordan, Kyrgyzstan, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mauritania, Namibia, Nepal, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Palau, Philippines, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Tanzania, Turkey, Uganda, Vanuatu, Yemen and Zambia.

**Fatalities**

48 total: 27 troops; 10 police; 1 military observer; 2 international civilian; and, 3 local civilian.

**Financial aspects**

Method of financing:
- Assessments in respect of a Special Account

Approved budget:
- 1 July 2009 - 30 June 2010: $1.598.94 million

---

**UNAMIS Mandate**

Following the signing of the 5 June 2004 Declaration in which the GoS and the SPLM/A confirmed their agreement to the six protocols and reconfirmed their commitment to completing the remaining peace negotiations, the Security Council, on the recommendation of the Secretary-General, established by [Resolution 1547](https://www.un.org/en/sections/unsecuritycouncil/resolutions/1547) of 11 June 2004 a special political mission, the United Nations Advance Mission in the Sudan (UNAMIS). UNAMIS was mandated to facilitate contacts with the parties concerned and to prepare for the introduction of an envisaged peace support operation. As set forth in SCR 1547, the mandate for UNAMIS was three-fold:

---

• to prepare the monitoring foreseen in the 25 September 2003 Framework Agreement on Security Arrangements, in which the parties agreed to implement an internationally-monitored ceasefire upon the signature of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. Monitoring and verification would be required for the redeployment of the parties' armed forces and for the large number of military personnel within new integrated units;
• to facilitate contacts with the parties;
• to prepare for the introduction of a full peacekeeping operation following the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement.

The Secretary-General appointed Jan Pronk as his Special Representative (SRSG) for the Sudan and head of UNAMIS, two Deputy Special Representatives (DSRSGs) and a Military Adviser. This team was supported by a number of international personnel, including military liaison and political and civil affairs staff, public information officers and experts in logistics and administration, as well as in other requisite areas of expertise.

The SRSG led UN peacemaking support to the IGAD-mediated talks on the North-South conflict, as well as to the African Union-mediated talks on the conflict in Darfur. In addition, a UN multidisciplinary team was assigned to the final stages of the North-South peace talks in Naivasha, Kenya, to provide support and to ensure complementarities between the outcome of the negotiations and preparations for an expanded operation in the Sudan.

The SRSG also worked along with the UN Country Team in Sudan to develop a unified structure to ensure that the UN was in the best position to support the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). UNAMIS administration and support elements focused on developing and refining operational plans on the ground, as well as preparing for the deployment of military and civilian personnel and providing effective forward support to the mission.

UNAMIS was transformed into the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS) on 24 March 2005, with the UN Security Council’s adoption of Resolution 1590 which tasked UNMIS with supporting the Government of Sudan and the SPLM/A in the implementation of the CPA.\textsuperscript{190}

UNMIS

Following the signing on 9 January 2005 of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) between the GoS and the SPLM/A, UNAMIS was transformed into the United Nations Mission in Sudan (UNMIS), with the UN Security Council’s adoption of resolution 1590 on 24 March 2005, establishing a full-fledged peacekeeping mission for Sudan.\textsuperscript{191} Acting on the recommendation of the Secretary-General, the Council decided that the tasks of UNMIS would be:

• to support implementation of the CPA signed by the parties;
• to facilitate and coordinate, within its capabilities and in its areas of deployment, the voluntary return of refugees and internally displaced persons and humanitarian assistance;
• to assist the parties in the mine action sector;
• to contribute towards international efforts to protect and promote human rights in Sudan, as well as to coordinate international efforts towards the protection of civilians, with particular attention to vulnerable groups including internally displaced persons, returning refugees, and women and

\textsuperscript{190} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{191} This and other Security Council resolutions pertaining to the UN Mission in Sudan are available at United Nations, ‘UNSC Resolutions’, United Nations.
children, within UNMIS’ capabilities and in close cooperation with other United Nations agencies, related organizations, and non-governmental organizations.

With respect to the armed forces of the GoS and SPLA, UNMIS has three fundamental mandates:

- to liaise with bilateral donors on the formation of the integrated units;
- to observe and monitor the movement and redeployments per the Ceasefire Agreement; and
- to assist in disarmament, demobilization and reintegration called for in the Ceasefire Agreement.

UNMIS is also mandated to assist the parties to the CPA in a number of additional ways that are common to integrated missions:

- develop an effective public information campaign to promote understanding of the peace process and the role of UNMIS;
- promote an inclusive approach including reconciliation;
- assist in restructuring of the civilian police;
- promotion of the rule of law, including the establishment of an independent judiciary, the promotion and protection of human rights, and the prevention of impunity; and
- provision of technical assistance to the parties with respect to elections and referenda provided for in the CPA.

In addition to the essential task of supporting the parties’ implementation of the CPA, UNMIS has three important responsibilities, to be fulfilled in coordination with international partners:

- **Refugees and IDPs and Humanitarian Assistance** - 'Within its capabilities and in its areas of deployment,' UNMIS is to 'facilitate and coordinate' particularly through the establishment of necessary security conditions, the voluntary return of refugees and IDPs and the provision of humanitarian assistance.
- **Demining** - In cooperation with its international partners, UNMIS is to provide humanitarian demining assistance, coordination and advice.
- **Human Rights and Civilian Protection** - Together with UN agencies, related organizations and NGOs, UNMIS is also 'to contribute to international efforts to protect and promote human rights in Sudan, as well as to coordinate' civilian protection.

**Responsibility for Darfur**

In resolution 1590, which established UNMIS, the Security Council 'request[ed] that UNMIS closely and continuously liaise and coordinate with all levels with the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS) with a view toward expeditiously reinforcing the effort to foster peace in Darfur.'

Additionally, after setting forth the UNMIS mandate, including with respect to human rights, in resolution 1590 the Security Council also 'underscore[d] the immediate need to rapidly increase the number of human rights monitors in Darfur.' It urged the Secretary-General and the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights to accelerate such deployment of human rights monitors to Darfur and to move forward with the formation of civilian monitoring protection teams.

**Chapter VII Authorization**

Acting under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the Security Council authorized UNMIS 'to take the necessary action in the areas of deployment of its forces and as it deems within its capabilities to protect UN property and the security and freedom of movement of United Nations personnel, humanitarian
workers as’ well as ‘without prejudice to the responsibility of the Sudanese government, to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence.’

Renewals of the Mandate


While not changing the mission’s mandate, in SCR 1663 (2006) of 24 March 2006, the Security Council referred to the existing UNMIS mandate and urged its attention to both the Darfur and Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) crises.

Supporting implementation of the CPA

Pursuant to paragraph 4 of Security Council resolution 1590 (2005), the principal mandate of UNMIS is ‘to support implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement’ through a variety of tasks. As foreseen by the UNAMIS mandate, first among these is to monitor and verify implementation of the ceasefire and to investigate violations.

The Status of the United Nations Mission in Sudan (SOMA)


UNAMIS Coordination and Command Arrangements

In its early stages of deployment, UNMIS entered into agreements, normally via Memoranda of Understanding (MoU), with the following organizations:

- Joint Military Commission (JMC), essentially placing the JMC under operational control of UNMIS until such time as UNMIS could replace the JMC and assume responsibility for its duties.193
- Verification Monitoring Team (VMT), agreeing to the continuation of VMT duties and the provision of VMT information to UNMIS until such time as UNMIS could assume responsibilities of the VMT.194
- United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE), agreeing upon terms of the provision of logistic support and assistance from UNMEE to UNMIS.195

UNMIS also developed a working relationship with AMIS on several fronts (political, civil affairs, human rights, humanitarian) and maintained permanent Military and UN CIVPOL liaison officers with AMIS, both

---

192 See UNMIS website.
194 Memorandum of Understanding between the United Nations Advanced Mission Sudan and the IGAD Verification and Monitoring Team (Sudan), 2005.
in Addis Ababa and El-Fasher. UNMIS will no doubt develop an even closer one with UNAMID. As a matter of course, UNMIS also conducts inter-mission cooperation with UNMEE and MONUC in a number of areas. For example:

- Ongoing, regular cooperation in the provision of such service support matters as sharing of logistic supply chains and facilities, coordination of flights, sharing of aviation resources, cross-border movement,
- Joint efforts towards the provision of emergency humanitarian supplies, medical support, etc.
- Pooling of resources for welfare and morale facilities.
- Coordination of visitors and training events within the region.
- Intelligence and information sharing on matters pertaining to:
  - movement of Refugees and IDPs,
  - movement of troops, rebels and military equipment and supplies,
  - terrorist or other security threats,
  - smuggling, gun running, slave trading
  - cross-border tribal conflicts, nomadic movement,
  - effects of drought famine and disease, and
  - any other regional, international stressors, disputes and conflicts.

**UNMIS Mission Structure**

As set out by the Secretary-General, the UN Mission in the Sudan is headed by his Special Representative and includes components focusing on the following four broad areas of engagement:

- good offices and political support for the peace process;
- security;
- governance;
- humanitarian and development assistance.

Good offices and political support for the peace process are addressed by the Secretary General's Special Representative, as well as political affairs and public information components. The political affairs component supports the Special Representative and the UN operation as a whole through the provision of political advice, reporting, analysis and assessment and secretariat support as required.

The Special Representative is assisted by two Deputy Special Representatives. One works closely with the Special Representative in addressing good offices and political support to the peace process and governance, while the other acts as Resident Coordinator and Humanitarian Coordinator for the Sudan and deals with assistance matters.

Security aspects are addressed by the military component by monitoring and verifying ceasefire agreements, protecting UN personnel and facilities, and ensuring freedom of movement for its personnel. Furthermore, the military protects civilians under imminent threat of physical violence and, within its capability, assists the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process, and supports other UN programmes.

Governance is addressed by the UN police, rule of law, human rights, civil affairs, electoral assistance and gender components. The UN police component assists in the development of a transparent police service while the rule of law component helps to support the establishment and operation of essential legislative, executive and judicial institutions of the Government of National Unity, as well as the government of southern Sudan.
Humanitarian and development assistance is addressed by components for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; humanitarian coordination; protection; recovery, return and reintegration; and mine action. The peace support operation also includes a mission support component and an integrated security management structure. In addition, HIV and personnel conduct units provide mission-wide advice and training.

The Mission is headquartered in Khartoum and is widely represented in the South, including in Juba, the capital of Southern Sudan. Because an operation of this scope and size requires a certain degree of decentralization, the Mission area includes six distinct sectors.¹⁹⁶

Unified Approach

As the Mission is dealing with a broad range of issues, the Secretary-General stressed the importance of a joint, integrated strategy among the UN agencies, funds and programmes in order to successfully implement the CPA and achieve the goal of ‘supporting the Sudanese people in establishing a peaceful and democratic Sudan where all citizens will live in conditions of greater dignity and security.’ Nevertheless, a clear distinction is maintained between the coordinating role of the Mission and the implementation responsibility of agencies, funds and programmes.

**UNAMIS Composition**

As of 31 October 2009, the strength of UNMIS was 10,003 uniformed personnel (including 8,821 military troops, 476 military observers and 715 police), and approximately 3,300 civilians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength</th>
<th>Authorized strength</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Up to 10,000 military personnel including some 750 military observers; up to 715 police; and an appropriate civilian component</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strength as of 31 October 2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10,003 total uniformed personnel, including 8,821 troops, 476 military observers, and 6715 police; supported by 807 international civilian personnel, 2,504 local civilian and 310 United Nations Volunteers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Statistics for international and local civilians are as of 31 August 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors of military personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia, Bangladesh, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Brazil, Cambodia, Canada, China, Croatia, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, India, Iran, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Mali, Moldova, Mongolia, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Kingdom, Uruguay, Zambia and Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors of police personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia, Bangladesh, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, China, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, India, Indonesia, Jordan, Jamaica, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, Mali, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Philippines, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Samoa, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United States, Uruguay, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fatalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49 total: 17 troops; 2 police; 3 military observers; 7 international civilians; 20 local civilians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial aspects

Method of financing:
Assessments in respect of a Special Account

Approved budget:

UNMIS is a multidimensional, integrated and unified mission comprising numerous and diverse components:

**Unified and Joint Structures**
UN Country Team (UNCT), Joint Operations Centre, Joint Mission Analysis Centre, Integrated Support Services and a Joint Logistics Operations Centre.

**Civil Affairs Section**
- Reporting to the Principal Deputy Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Political Affairs, it consists of a main office in Khartoum and a network of field offices.

**Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration (DDR)**
- As described in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) and mandated by SC Resolution 1590, UNMIS is “to assist in the establishment of the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme as called for in the Comprehensive Peace Agreement, with particular attention to the special needs of women and child combatants, and its implementation through voluntary disarmament and weapons collection and destruction”.

**Gender Unit**
- The Gender Unit was established in March 2005, in accordance with UN Security Council Resolution (SCR) 1590, which reaffirms SCR 1325, to implement a plan of action to guide the process of gender mainstreaming in all aspects of the work of UNMIS.

**Human Rights Office**
- The mandate of the UNMIS Human Rights Office is derived from the UN Security Council’s Resolution 1590, which called for ensuring an adequate human rights presence, and expertise within UNMIS to carry out human rights promotion, civilian protection and monitoring activities.

**Military Component**
- A total of 10,000 military personnel have been authorized for deployment as part of UNMIS' multinational peacekeeping force, to assist and support the Government of Sudan and the Sudan People's Liberation Movement/Army (SPLM/A) in the implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. Of the 10,000 peacekeepers, there are 750 UN Military Observers (UNMOs), approximately 4,000 in a protection force responsible for protecting UN staff, equipment, and installations as well as helping Sudanese authorities to protect any civilians who come are in imminent danger, and another 4,000 who are involved in administrative and logistical support activities, along with demining and reconstruction work.

**Police Component**
- The UNMIS Police component is tasked with assisting in the development of Sudan's police service, aiming to help create a modern, effective and efficient Sudanese police service which operates fairly and impartially and in observance of the rule of law, with respect for human rights and in accordance with internationally accepted standards of conduct. When fully deployed, the UNMIS Police team will consist of more than 700 police officers and policing experts from a range of UN member states.

**Political Affairs Division**
- The mission of the Political Affairs Division is to provide advice and support on all political matters to the SRSG and his Principal Deputy. The Division is headed by a Director of Political Affairs and has a total strength of 11 Political Affairs Officers and three Administrative Assistants.

**Public Information Office**
- The UNMIS Public Information Office provides information about UNMIS and its activities to all the stakeholders in the Sudanese peace process, including the Sudanese people, from the community to the national level; the two parties to the peace process; the Sudanese media; and the humanitarian community. In addition, the UNMIS Public Information Office provides information to the international media, troop contributing and donor countries, and the Sudanese diaspora.
Rule of Law and Judicial Systems Advisory - The UNMIS Rule of Law and Judicial System Advisory Unit obtains its mandate from UN Security Council Resolution 1590 (24 March 2005). The Unit provides legal policy advice to senior UN management and supports the CPA and constitutional process in Sudan. Key tasks include monitoring the Parties’ adherence to their rule of law-related commitments in the CPA, Interim National Constitution (INC), the Interim Constitution Southern Sudan (ICSS), and state constitutions and provision of technical assistance where needed; assistance and support to newly-established commissions, including the Commission to Protect the Rights of non-Muslims in the National Capital, the National Judicial Service Commission, the revised Joint National Transition Team and the National Constitutional Review Commission, as well as National, Southern Sudan and local actors. Support to law reform processes will also be a priority. The Corrections Advisory component provides policy expertise to corrections management in Sudan. In the Rule of Law Sector, UNMIS works closely with UNDP and other UN agencies, NGOs, donors and national stakeholders.

United Nations Volunteer (UNV) - United Nations Volunteers is the United Nations focal point for promoting and harnessing volunteerism for effective development. It is a trusted development partner because it respects each country’s control over its own future while bringing countries together to work on shared challenges.197

Implementation of CPA and deployment of UNMIS

Deployment of UNMIS personnel and resources, as well as progress reports on implementation of the CPA are provided, on an ongoing basis, to the UN Security Council by the Secretary-General.198

Missions in Neighbouring Countries

Ethiopia & Eritrea UNMEE: In June 2000, after two years of fighting in a border dispute, Ethiopia and Eritrea signed a cessation of hostilities agreement following proximity talks led by Algeria and the Organization of African Unity. In July, the Security Council set up UNMEE to maintain liaison with the parties and establish a mechanism for verifying the ceasefire. In September 2000, the Council authorized deployment within UNMEE of up to 4,200 military personnel to monitor the cessation of hostilities and to help ensure the observance of security commitments.199

In the course of the implementation of UNMEE’s mandate, Eritrean frustration over what it calls the Ethiopian occupation of Eritrean territory around the town of Badme led to increasing tensions between the government and the UN mission. When Eritrea began to cut off fuel and food supplies to UNMEE, the mission had to begin relocating to Ethiopia in February 2008. According to the UN Security Council, Eritrea’s obstructions towards the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) had reached a level undermining the basis of the Mission’s mandate and had compelled it to temporarily relocate. In early June, the Security Council announced that a decision on the terms of a future engagement in Ethiopia and Eritrea, as well as the future of the Mission, would be taken in the light of consultations with the parties.

Democratic Republic of Congo MONUC: The United Nations Security Council established MONUC to facilitate the implementation of the Lusaka Accord signed in 1999. With a budget exceeding one billion

198 The most recent report was provided as of 31 January 2008 and it, along with all previous reports are available at http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N08/217/07/PDF/N0821707.pdf?OpenElement
dollars, it is the largest and most expensive mission in the Department of Peace Keeping Operations (DPKO). MONUC’s mandate can be broken down into four phases: Phase one involved forcibly implementing the ceasefire agreement. Phase two involved its monitoring, and the reporting of any violations through the proper channels. The third phase, still underway, centers on the DDRRR (disarmament, demobilization, repatriation, resettlement and reintegration) process. Phase four, also in progress, includes facilitating the transition towards the organization of credible elections. MONUC is placed under Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. Its mandate authorizes it to use all means deemed necessary, within the limits of its capacities and in the areas of deployment of its armed units, to protect civilians under imminent threat of physical violence; and to contribute to the improvement of the security conditions.

Chad / CAR - MINURCAT & EUFOR TCHAD/CAR - The deployment of an EU military force to Chad and the Central African Republic, originally scheduled for the end of 2007, was delayed for several months due to complications, including a lack of helicopters. Some analysts have also manifested concerns regarding the force’s operational capacity on the ground arguing that the force’s multi-dimensional nature and Chapter VII mandate may prove to be too much. Lieutenant General Patrick Nash is the Operation Commander of the new force, which will be comprised of up to 4,300 troops from 20 nations; France is expected to provide half of the personnel.

Relief Activities Updated December 31, 2009
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COORDINATION BETWEEN UNAMID AND THE UNCT/IASC

History of relief assistance

Operation Lifeline Sudan

Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS) was created in 1989 in response to the war induced famine in Bahr el Ghazal region of Southern Sudan. It was the first humanitarian programme that sought to assist internally displaced and war affected civilians during an ongoing conflict within a sovereign country. OLS was based on an agreement between the UN, the Sudanese Government and the SPLA to establish “corridors of tranquillity” to civilians on either side of the conflict.

OLS lasted from 1989 to 2005, and covered both North and South Sudan. However, there were stark differences between the operations in the North and South. OLS activities in Government held areas, including the garrison towns in Southern Sudan were organised through Khartoum and were subject to strict regulation by the Government. The Southern Sector was based on the so called Ground Rules

200 MONUC website: United Nations Department of Peacekeeping Operations, MONUC.
201 PPC Mission Monitor Website.
205 Karim et. al.
concept which provided a unique framework for relations between OLS agencies and the opposition movements.206

These different operational regimes resulted in uneven access to the affected populations. The OLS review of 1996 assessed that the scope of coverage of OLS in the Northern sector depended more on GoS approval rather than actual need. This uneven ability to respond to humanitarian needs is one of the major criticisms of OLS.207 Aid delivery in the South was also subject to manipulation, given the Ground Rules provision that access needed to be approved by the rebel movements. Distribution of humanitarian assistance was thus uneven – with a concentration of aid in more secure areas such as Equatoria and a lack of assistance to Northern Bahr el Ghazal and Upper Nile.208

UNICEF assumed the coordination role for OLS in the Southern sector and undertook the provision of shared services and established a safety and security system. This lead agency concept was unique to OLS.209 Participating agencies signed Letters of Understanding which outlined basic programme requirements and OLS principles. By 1993, when OLS had developed into a massive air lift operation, WFP took over responsibility for logistics whilst UNICEF kept management of programme coordination.

Challenges of transition: humanitarian operations post-CPA

The implementation of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement led to the transition from OLS to a new structure. The transition from OLS started on 1 February 2005 with the creation of the Deputy Humanitarian and Resident Coordinator (HC/RC) post in Juba, the capital of Southern Sudan. Funding for the coordination function shifted from UNICEF to UNDP and then to UNMIS in November 2005 when the DRC/HC was brought into the Mission structure under the pillar of the DSRSG/RC/HC.210 Although there was no formal end to OLS, the establishment of the Government of Southern Sudan essentially rendered the operation closed and the Ground Rules void.

Challenges of integration

In the months leading up to the establishment of the Government of Southern Sudan in July 2005, the UN agencies planned the merger of the operations in the Northern and Southern sectors. There were multiple additional challenges, including relocating operations from Nairobi to Southern Sudan, integrating the former garrison towns into the Southern programme, and integrating UN programming with that of the incoming mission.211

To address these challenges, the UNCT in Khartoum decided on the following actions:212

1) Each UN agency should maintain a significant representation in Juba
2) Agencies in the South would have budgetary autonomy so resources for the UNCT South would not flow through Khartoum and support the line Ministries in the South.
3) There would be management decentralisation for representatives in Juba.

207 Karim et. al.
209 Karim et. al.
212 D Gressly, Interview with UNMIS Regional Coordinator, Personal Communication, 15 February 2009, Juba, Sudan.
4) Technical support would be provided directly to Juba and would not be channelled through Khartoum.

The successful implementation of these objectives was dependent on a declaration by the GOSS guaranteeing the freedom of movement of humanitarian agencies between SPLA held areas and garrison towns, which was achieved in August 2005. By September 2005 the DHC/RC had relocated from Nairobi to Juba, and agencies were moving operations into Southern Sudan. By January 2006, agencies were established in Juba although many key office functions were retained in Nairobi. By January 2007, while UN agencies were set up in Juba, the majority of NGO operations remained in Nairobi. NGOs were more reluctant to move their operations, because of the expenses and financial risks involved and the reluctance of staff to move to the South. Shifting NGO operations proved the major challenge to consolidation of relief operations within Southern Sudan.

DARFUR

---

Figure 7: Darfur IDP map and population\textsuperscript{216}

Overview

The conflict between the Government and rebel movements in Darfur began in 2004, and has created the largest humanitarian operation in the world, with 4.7 million people affected by the conflict receiving assistance and over 800,000 people fleeing from Darfur into Chad (250,000), CAR and beyond.\textsuperscript{217}

\textsuperscript{216} OCHA IMU, Khartoum, IDP Sites and Populations in Darfur, 1 October 2008.

\textsuperscript{217} OCHA IMU, Khartoum, IDP Sites and Populations in Darfur, 1 October 2008.
Aid agencies were slow in mobilizing an initial response to the crisis, and a large scale response was not activated until June 2004 when the Government eased restrictions on access. By January 2005, 1.8 million people had been displaced among a total of 2.4 million conflict affected persons. Since 2004, the humanitarian operation has expanded exponentially, and declining mortality rates and other key indicators over time indicates that the humanitarian operation continues to provide essential lifesaving assistance to a large proportion of the vulnerable population.

Figure 8: Darfur Humanitarian Indicators 2004-07

By 1 October 2008, there were 2.7 million IDPs (an increase of 200,000 from July 2008). Displacement continues to increase, with over 317,000 newly displaced in 2008. In 2009, over 214,000 people were newly displaced between January and June alone. The humanitarian and relief effort provides assistance to over 4 million vulnerable beneficiaries and comprises over 17,000 aid workers and over 200 different UN agencies and NGOs.

The operational environment has become increasingly volatile and complex, with the fragmentation of rebel groups, a deteriorating security situation and increased attacks on humanitarian workers. Attacks on aid workers in 2008 have doubled compared with the previous year. In 2008, a total of 277 humanitarian vehicles were hijacked (compared with 137 in 2007), 218 humanitarian personnel were abducted (147 in 2007) and 192 humanitarian premises attacked (93 in 2007). The ICC arrest warrant and instability and the South led to an increase in attacks on humanitarian workers in 2009 and resulted in more abductions and deaths.

Non-Governmental Organizations
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NGOs are the main implementing partners of UN agencies on the ground in Darfur, providing essential medical care and services, water provision, emergency food distribution, shelter and sanitation efforts to millions in Darfur, both within camps for the internally displaced and in more remote rural areas. UN agencies such as the World Food Programme, UNICEF and WHO work hand in hand with partner NGOs to deliver key basic services and life-saving assistance, and NGOs have a much wider presence on the ground than UN agencies.

On 4 March 2009 the International Criminal Court (ICC) issued an arrest warrant for Sudanese President Al Bashir for crimes against humanity and war crimes. Immediately thereafter the Government of Sudan expelled from the country the following 13 NGOs whom it accused of providing information to the ICC: Oxfam GB, CARE, Save the Children UK and USA, the Norwegian Refugee Council, MSF-Netherlands and France, the International Rescue Committee, Action against Hunger, CHF International, Mercy Corps, Solidarite and PACT. The expulsion of these agencies is expected to have a dramatic effect on the delivery and scope of the relief effort in Darfur. For example, in Kalma camp in South Darfur, 91,000 internally displaced people are fully dependent on Oxfam and IRC to provide health care and water provision. In Kass in South Darfur, 100,000 people depend on IRC and Oxfam to provide clean drinking water and medical care. The ability of the UN agencies to deliver assistance to those in need is severely hampered by the loss of their implementing partners. Until their expulsion, Action Against Hunger delivered emergency food aid on behalf of the World Food Programme to 450,000 people in Darfur, and CARE worked closely with UNICEF in providing water, sanitation and health care for 1.5 million people in West Darfur. The remaining NGOs and UN agencies, are taking measures to distribute food, water, and health services in the short-term. Currently, they do not have the resources to adequately distribute seeds and tools to farmers, which will have severe long-term effects on Darfur's food supply. The Sudanese Government has since backed off from its commitment to expel remaining NGOs and has readmitted four American organizations provided they send new workers to Darfur.

Structure of the humanitarian operation

The relief operation in Darfur is coordinated by the RC/HC based in Khartoum and the Deputy RC/HC for North Sudan based in El Fasher (North Darfur). While UN agencies and NGOs with national programmes remain based in Khartoum, most agencies have senior representatives throughout Darfur. At the state level, assistance is coordinated through the Inter Agency Management Groups (IAMGs) comprising UNCT/HCT agencies, ICRC and international NGOs.

---
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Figure 9: Coordination between UNMIS, UNAMID, the UNCT, IASC and RC/HC in support of humanitarian and development activities in Darfur.

DO - Designated Official

SMT - Security Management Team

HCT – Humanitarian Country Team

UNCT – UN Country team

IASC – Inter Agency Standing Committee

JSR – Joint AU/UN Special Representative

DRC/HC – Deputy Resident and Humanitarian Coordinator

HRDLS - Humanitarian, Recovery, Development and Liaison Section

UNAMID ST – UNAMID State teams

IAMG – Inter-Agency Management Groups

RCSO – Resident Coordinator Support Office
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Coordination with UNAMID

Prior to the arrival of the United Nations/African Union Hybrid Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) UNMIS had a limited presence in Darfur. Protection of civilians, return and reintegration and demining activities were coordinated by UNMIS,233 but delivery of assistance remained the responsibility of the UNCT.234

Contrary to UNMIS, UNAMID is not an integrated mission. While it is mandated to contribute to security for humanitarian assistance, the responsibility for planning and delivering humanitarian and recovery assistance remains with the UN agencies and NGO community.235 The coordination mechanisms between UNAMID and the Humanitarian Country Team have been developed in 2008, and due to the complexity of the structure, challenges remain.236 The humanitarian community was heavily involved in the UNAMID deployment plan, which helped to ensure that UNAMID’s deployment focuses on large IDP populations and areas of humanitarian operation. Increased UNAMID patrols have started to provide security in Kalma (South Darfur), the largest IDP camp in Darfur, which were scaled up at the end of 2008 in response to growing tensions in Kalma.237

Coordination between UNAMID and the UNCT/IASC238

Senior Management Level

- JSR and the RC/HC meet as needed in Khartoum and Darfur. JSR and other senior staff of UNAMID are invited to UNCT meetings in Khartoum.
- The Darfur based D-RC/HC meets regularly with the UNAMID management team and works closely with the Head of the Humanitarian, Recovery and Liaison unit in UNAMID. A co-location in El Fasher facilitates this cooperation. This cooperation has resulted in the inclusion of humanitarian priorities in planning by UNAMID for its military patrols and the establishment of UNAMID team sites.
- The Humanitarian Country team meets regularly with UNAMID, rotating between Khartoum and different locations in Darfur. This allows for common coordination on key humanitarian issues.
- Security Management Teams – UNCT and UNAMID have established a mechanism whereby the UNCT participates at the weekly Darfur Security Management Teams via video or phone link.
- The UNCT/HCT remains the forum where issues related to policy, strategy and principles will be referred to. However, the Head of the HRDLS attends these meetings on a weekly basis and provides substantive input from UNAMID.

State Level Coordination

- The Inter Agency Management Group (IAMGs) report to the UNCT/HCT and liaise closely with the UNAMID state teams.
- The IAMGs in consultation with the D-HC/RC deal with all day-to-day and operational issues requiring immediate attention but also liaise with state level UNAMID teams.

236 Haq, 2009.
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National Level Coordination

There are eight national coordination fora related to components of UN work in Darfur: RRR, High Level Committee on the Darfur Communiqué, DDR, Mine Action, HIV/AIDS, Elections, Census, and Child protection. UNAMID is represented at the national coordination fora dealing with components related to UNAMID’s work in Darfur.

UN and Partners Work Plan 2005-2009

The JAM provides the overall framework for development priorities in the interim period in Sudan. However, the UN and Partners have developed annual Work Plans from 2005 to 2009 which have outlined the humanitarian, recovery and development activities and requirements on an annual basis. The Work Plan brings together government counterparts, donors, NGOs and UN agencies to decide on the strategies, activities and requirements to address the humanitarian needs and to build the foundations for recovery and development. From 2005-2008, the plan included humanitarian, recovery and development projects. The table below sets out the funding received in the period 2006-2008.

Figure 12: Work Plan 2006 - 2008 Funding Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Requirements</td>
<td>$1.60 billion</td>
<td>$1.30 billion</td>
<td>$2.01 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Contributions</td>
<td>$1.14 billion</td>
<td>$1.02 billion</td>
<td>$1.49 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coverage</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bilateral and Other Funding</td>
<td>$937 million</td>
<td>$840 million</td>
<td>$1.33 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Humanitarian Fund</td>
<td>$171 million</td>
<td>$149 million</td>
<td>$154 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Emergency Response Fund</td>
<td>$36 million</td>
<td>$26 million</td>
<td>$16 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL Contributions</td>
<td>$1.14 billion</td>
<td>$1.02 billion</td>
<td>$1.49 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Humanitarian Funding to Sudan outside the Work Plan 2006 - 2008</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funding outside WP*</td>
<td>$397 million</td>
<td>$370 million</td>
<td>$316 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work Plan Funding Summary, UN OCHA 2009

The 2009 UN and Partners Work Plan for Sudan does not include recovery and development projects and focuses only on humanitarian and early recovery needs. The Work Plan requests $2.18 billion for 880 humanitarian and early recovery programmes. So far, $619 has been secured, leaving a net requirement of $1.6 billion. The Plan outlines the funding and operational framework for UN and Partner agencies to provide more than four million people with food aid and 1.5 million with safe water, to enable 54,000 refugees to return safely, to enrol 800,000 children in school, to clear mines from more than 7500 km of road and ensure that more than 400,000 have access to basic health services. Early recovery

---
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240 Ibid.
projects to accelerate the path to development will require $787 million. Almost half of the requirement ($1.05 billion) is for relief and early recovery in Darfur. The Work Plan runs on an annual cycle but a mid-year review provides an analysis of achievements and challenges to delivery to date.

**Development** Updated December 31, 2009

**SECTION CONTENTS:** OVERVIEW

**Overview**

Sudan is the largest country in Africa, bordering nine countries and with a population of 37 million. Assistance and needs vary greatly across Sudan’s diverse geography; from the humanitarian relief provided to the millions displaced in Darfur and the refugee communities in Eastern Sudan, to the recovery and development activities in Southern Sudan and the Three Protocol States. Sudan faces complex development challenges: enduring one of the longest running armed conflicts in the region, experiencing large inequality across its regions, and an economy that is heavily dependent on one resource: oil.

Ranked 150th out of 182 countries by the Human Development Report, Sudan has some of the lowest development indicators in the world, and poverty remains widespread. Estimated poverty rates are up to 90% in Southern Sudan and the Three Protocol States; in some regions clean water is available to only 1 in 4 and only 1 in 5 children complete primary school. Development inequality between the different regions is stark, social development is uneven, and Millenium Development Goals indicators are low. For example, school enrolment rates in Northern Sudan have reached 64.3% whereas in Southern Sudan the rate is 30%.

Economic growth over the last few years has however been strong. Since the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement in 2005, Sudan’s economy, with an average of 9% GDP growth, has become one of the fastest growing in Africa due to the expansion of its petroleum base. While agriculture represents the largest share of GDP, at roughly a third, foreign investment and rising domestic demand have spurred growth in the construction and service sectors. Growth is, however, uneven across the sectors (see Comparative Statistics Sudan chart, p. 4), and Sudan lacks the political and

---

246 At the time of writing, the results of the 2008 census had not yet been released. Census results are due to be released in March 2009. This estimate is from the following: World Bank, Country Brief: Sudan, World Bank, 2008.
247 The three areas include Souther Kordofan, Blue Niel and Abyei.
253 World Bank, Country Brief Sudan.
economic institutions that can sustain and support rapid, pro-poor growth. Consequently, the fiscal position in the post-CPA period has deteriorated and domestic debt has increased.

Figure 1. Macroeconomic Situation in Sudan, presentation to the Sudan Consortium May 2008: IMF/UN and World Bank

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty</th>
<th>Southern Sudan</th>
<th>Darfur</th>
<th>Khartoum and Northern Areas</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More than 90% of the population in Southern Sudan currently live on less than 1 dollar a day. Although chronic hunger in Southern Sudan has reduced, it still stands at 13.5%.</td>
<td>Chronic hunger in Darfur stands at 12%.</td>
<td>Chronic hunger in Khartoum and Northern Areas stands at 9%.</td>
<td>Countrywide estimates on poverty are in the range of 50-60%. Chronic hunger nationwide stands at 11.3%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1.2 million vulnerable people in Southern Sudan are facing food insecurity and are in need of food aid during 2008.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maternal Mortality</strong></td>
<td>One out of seven women who become pregnant in Southern Sudan will die.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only 10% of all deliveries in Southern Sudan are attended by any skilled personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• There are only 10 certified midwives in Southern Sudan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46% of all deliveries in Darfur are attended by a nurse or midwife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70% of all deliveries in Khartoum and Northern Areas are attended by any skilled personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49% of all deliveries countrywide are attended by any skilled personnel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child Mortality</strong></td>
<td>Although the infant mortality rate in Southern Sudan has decreased, it stands at 102 per 1000 live births.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Although the under-five mortality rate has decreased, one out of every 7 child will die before their fifth birthday (134 per 1000 live births).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The infant mortality rate in Darfur stands at 76 per 1000 live births.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The under-five mortality rate in Darfur Stands at 110 per 1000 live births.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The infant mortality rate in Khartoum and Northern Areas stands at 70 per 1000 live births.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The under-five mortality rate in Khartoum and Northern Areas stands at 104 per 1000 live births.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Countrywide, the infant mortality rate went down from 143 in 1990 to 83 in 2006.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The countrywide under-five mortality stands at 117per 1000 live births.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Immunisation</strong></td>
<td>Southern Sudan has one of the lowest routine immunisation coverage rates in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only 17% of children are fully vaccinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only 28% of children in Southern Sudan receive measles vaccination before their first birthday.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>29% of all children in Darfur are fully vaccinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56% of all children in Khartoum and the Northern Areas are fully vaccinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41% of all children countrywide are fully vaccinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Malaria</strong></td>
<td>Malaria is considered hyper-endemic in Southern Sudan,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 81% of households in Darfur do not have an</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 77% of households in Khartoum and the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5 million people are estimated to have malaria attacks every</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accounting for more than 40% of all health facility visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HIV/AIDS</strong></td>
<td>In 2007 the HIV/AIDS prevalence in Southern Sudan was estimated at 3.1%, but increasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than 70% of women aged 15-49 has no knowledge about HIV prevention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water and Sanitation</strong></td>
<td>More than 50% of the population in Southern Sudan does not have access to improved drinking water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only 6.4% of the population use improved sanitation facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Education</strong></td>
<td>Less than 50% of all children in Southern Sudan receive 5 years of primary school education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>While 1.3 million children are enrolled, only 1.9% completes primary school education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For every 1,000 primary school students there is only one teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• 85% of adults in Southern Sudan do not know how to read or write.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td>92% of women in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacement</td>
<td>Southern Sudan cannot read or write</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Since January 2008, 187,000 people have been displaced by tribal and armed conflict in Southern Sudan.</td>
<td>Only 27% of girls in Southern Sudan are attending primary school. A 15 year old girl has a higher chance of dying in childbirth than completing school.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: UNOCHA, Comparative Statistics Sudan, 2009

**Sudan’s Development Road Map**

---

Joint Assessment Mission

As negotiations on the CPA were being finalised, the Government of Sudan, SPLM, World Bank, UN, IGAD and the IGAD partners’ forum called for a donor conference to pledge funds for reconstruction. In preparation for this conference, and working together with the Government of Sudan and the SPLM, the World Bank and UN co-led a Joint Assessment Mission (JAM) of Sudan’s recovery, reconstruction and development needs in 2004 and 2005. The year-long assessment exercise estimated total reconstruction
and development needs for the period 2005 - 2007 of $4.3 billion in the North and $3.6 billion in Southern Sudan, with an additional $700 million for the three Areas.  

Some have criticised the JAM process for an over-dependence on state-led development, a lack of focus on income guarantee and restitution schemes and the lack of a justice component. During the lessons learnt review jointly conducted by the UN and World Bank, the difficulties of coordination between Nairobi and Sudan and the lack of emphasis on early recovery planning and capacity building in Southern Sudan were highlighted.

**Multi Donor Trust Funds**

The CPA specified that two Multi-Donor Trust Funds (MDTFs) be established to facilitate the coordination of external donor financing of Sudan’s reconstruction and development needs in the South and North, respectively. The MDTF’s are administered by the World Bank and primarily executed by the Governments of National Unity and Southern Sudan. The UN agencies are implementing partners of MDTF projects. All programmes submitted for MDTF financing are part of either the Government of National unity or the Government of Southern Sudan’s development plan and are consistent with the priorities outlined in the JAM. At the start of implementation, MDTF supported projects in Southern Sudan experienced major difficulties in reconciling the need for rapid delivery of results with the low absorption capacity on the ground, and the need to ensure adequate fiduciary controls and government ownership.

At a pledging conference held in Oslo, Norway, in April 2005, donors pledged over $508.15 million for the two MDTFs. The donors include The Netherlands, Norway, United Kingdom, European Commission, Sweden, Germany, Denmark, Finland, Italy, Iceland, and Greece. Since Oslo, 6 additional donors pledged $87.2 million.
As of January 2009, donors have contributed a total of $768 million to both the National and Southern Sudan MDTF. The National MDTF supports Government capacity building, reform of the judiciary, health, education, water and sanitation, infrastructure and development, livestock, introduction of the new currency and the census. Net donor contribution to the National MDTF is $266,929 million and disbursement is $101,420. The Southern Sudan MDTF focuses on public works, transport and infrastructure, fiduciary system support, education, health and water provision, capacity building and private sector development. Donor contributions to the Southern Sudan MDTF are $500,771 and disbursement $167,873.

Sudan Consortium

The Sudan Consortium provides a forum to annually review progress in implementing the social and economic aspects of Sudan’s 2005 Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). The Consortium is jointly chaired by the Sudan Government of National Unity (GoNU) and the Government of Southern Sudan (GoSS), and organized by the UN and the World Bank. The structure grew out of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement. The first Consortium conference took place in Paris, March 2006, where participants reaffirmed an overall pledge of $4.5 billion for three years to support Sudan’s recovery under the peace accord.
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265 Ibid.
266 These figures are the latest available from the World Bank in Khartoum, They have not yet been uploaded to the World Bank Website, but monthly updates for MDTF National and Southern Sudan can be found here.
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Subsequently, Sudan Consortium meetings were held in Khartoum, in May 2007, and in Oslo, in May 2008. A total of 45 international delegations representing donor countries, international organizations and civil society participated at the meeting. At the meeting, donors pledged USD 4.8 billion in total support to humanitarian, recovery and development efforts in the whole of Sudan, for the period 2008-2011. Part of the funds for development efforts will be channeled through two complementary mechanisms: the Multi Donor Trust Funds administrated by the World Bank which will receive an estimated US$650 million; and the newly created Sudan Recovery Fund for Southern Sudan, administered by the UN.

Current financing of the Joint Assessment Mission: The JAM estimated total costs of $7.9 billion for the first phase of CPA implementation (2005-2007) with an additional $0.7 billion for the three Areas. The JAM prioritised assistance to war-affected areas and the development of basic service provision rather than large scale infrastructure. In Southern Sudan, the largest components focused on new infrastructure, expansion of basic services, and institutional reform and capacity building.

The ability of donors to allocate significant funds for recovery and development activities has been constrained by the continued need for humanitarian aid throughout Sudan. The JAM assumed that humanitarian aid would gradually decline over time and that there would be a corresponding increase in aid for recovery and development. However, between 2005 and 2007, humanitarian aid continued to dominate overall aid to Sudan. Out of a total aid of $5.3 billion, nearly $4.3 billion was committed for humanitarian purposes and only $1.1 billion for recovery and development activities.

While donors contribution has been lower than the JAM estimates, it has been significantly higher than the pledges made at Oslo in 2005.

The ability of the donors to allocate significant funds for recovery and development activities has been constrained by large and expanding humanitarian aid.

---

272 Ibid.
Canada’s involvement in Sudan dates back to the beginnings of the UNMIS and UNMID missions. Operation UGURAL was Canada’s contribution to the African Union Mission in Sudan (AMIS). The Canadian Forces initially loaned $1.4 million dollars worth of equipment and then sent 105 armoured fighting vehicles to the AU force. The military also aided in strategic planning, air operations, contracting, logistics and operations, land operations, and trained AMIS soldiers on Canadian equipment. In July 2004, a small number of Canadian Officers participated in the UN Advance Mission in Sudan that laid the groundwork for future peace operations. Currently, Canada’s Task Force Darfur is supporting UNAMID with 7 military personnel and 105 armoured vehicles. Task Force Sudan is supporting UNMIS with 24 troops, including Lt. Colonel Randall Callan, the Force Legal Advisor. Along with its military contribution, Canada also participates in humanitarian relief efforts and development. The Stabilization
and Reconstruction Task Force (START) is working to strengthen the Sudanese judiciary system, community security, federalism and the DDR program. 275

Despite its role, Canada has faced criticism both at home and abroad for not playing a leading role in Sudan. Many critics accuse the Conservative government of diverting attention and resources away from peace operations and humanitarian work. In 2004, Prime Minister Paul Martin (Liberal) used his speech before the UN General Assembly to encourage the international community to stop the violence in Darfur. The current Prime Minister, Stephen Harper, has shifted focus away from Sudan and to Afghanistan. His government argues that Afghanistan is a more pressing crisis and Canada does not have the troops or the resources to sustain operations in two countries. 276 Liberal Senator Roméo Dallaire, the Former UN Force Commander in Rwanda, rejects this claim. More importantly, he argues that because Canada is a middle power with no history of colonialism, it needs to take a leading role in Sudan and rally other middle powers to contribute to the peace process and humanitarian aid. 277

**Key Challenges** Updated December 31, 2009

The structure and content of this page draws heavily on Alex de Waal’s study “Sudan - What Kind of State? What Kind of Crisis?”. In this study, de Waal notes that in its half century of independent statehood, Sudan has only rarely and briefly been at peace. Analyst Alex de Waal has established five hypotheses which, in his view, can account for the outbreak and continuation of conflicts in the country:

- Clash of identities and its variant, the fruitless search for a cohesive identity;
- Centre-periphery inequality and economic exploitation;
- Conflict over scarce resources;
- Intra-elite competition at the centre and the struggle to consolidate the state;


“Brute causes”: criminality, individual agency and the perpetuation of a cycle of violence;

These hypotheses will be explored further below. Alex de Waal draws three main conclusions from his analysis:

Sudan’s conflict is over-determined. Each of the different hypotheses has some traction. The multiplicity of causes of the crisis makes Sudan’s conflicts peculiarly intractable;

The dominant elite, though unable to resolve its internal differences and establish a consolidated state, can continue to survive and even prosper amid disorder and crisis in the peripheries;

The road to stability lies through Khartoum. Stability at the center is the key if progress is to be made on all other issues facing Sudan. The promise of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA) is national democratic transformation, but its sequence of elections-referendum-forging of national identity appears to be a recipe for instability, and its power-sharing formula appears to be likely to result in deadlock.

**Clash of Identities**

While the war between the Sudanese government in Khartoum and the SPLM/A in the South was not simply a matter of religious differences, it was argued that the various factors contributing to the conflict found expression in religious terms. Since religion had been so significant in defining communal identity, issues such as racial discrimination and the disparity in wealth and power between North and South were seen by many as inseparable from religion.

The potency of religion within this context was derived from both its influence on ethnic identity and the close link between nationalism and religious beliefs. These two issues came together in what Francis Deng called the "war of visions" for the country. The predominantly Muslim North has historically perceived Sudan as a single country composed of one people divided by colonial powers. Northern policies subsequently sought to "re-unite" the country through a process of Arabization and Islamization. Such policies, however, generated antagonism among the southern population whose indigenous cultural values combined with Christianity to create a common identity, one defined largely in opposition to Northern attitudes and policies. Because government policy since independence has by and large disregarded Sudan's multi-religious character and the South's contrasting identity, conflict and civil war remained endemic.

Contrary to the civil war between North and South, the Darfur conflict cannot be characterized in religious terms but color-based and Arab-African labels have been widely used, not least by the belligerents themselves. Some scholars and activists believe that Darfurians are (and have been) on the receiving end of deep-rooted racism.

**Centre-Periphery**

‘Centre-periphery marginalization’ is considered to be one of the root causes of Sudan’s conflicts. Much of Sudan’s national wealth has a tendency to flow to Khartoum without being redistributed to the country’s underdeveloped rural regions. This trend seems to be part of a more fundamental pattern of long standing economic disparities, political exclusion and social and cultural deprivation in the distribution of political and economic power between the centre and the peripheries. The country inherited from colonialism a highly centralized authoritarian governance system and an uneven pattern of regional development. These
structural elements shaped the later evolution of the modern Sudanese state and contributed to the marginalization of the peripheries, especially in the South. Both factors are mutually reinforcing, since in authoritarian systems economic and social development is often dependent on political leverage and access to political power. Without political backing, marginalized groups and regions have only limited access to social and economic services and institutions.

**Local Struggles**

A number of commentators, journalists and analysts have recently focused on competition for natural resources (land, livestock and water), increasingly scarce due to global warming, as the trigger of the conflict in Sudan. An example for the link between conflict and the demand for natural resources is the great drought and famine of 1984-85, which led to localized conflicts that generally pitted pastoralists against farmers in a struggle for diminishing resources, culminating in the Fur-Arab war of 1987-89. Sudan, along with other countries in the Sahel belt, has suffered several long and devastating droughts in the past few decades, the UNEP assessment pointed out. The scale of historical climate change, as recorded in Northern Darfur, is almost unprecedented: the reduction in rainfall has turned millions of hectares of already marginal semi-desert grazing land into desert. The impact of climate change is considered to be directly related to the conflict in the region, as desertification has added significantly to the stress on the livelihoods of pastoralist societies, forcing them to move south to find pasture.

Throughout Sudan’s recorded history, pastoralists resisting the shrinkage and degradation of rangelands have been at the centre of local conflicts: competing with other groups for choice grazing land; moving and grazing livestock on cropland without consent; reducing competition by forcing other pastoralists and agriculturalists off previously shared land, said the UN agency’s report. In this context, it is important to emphasize that the UN agency considers the pastoralists versus agriculturalists theory simplistic. “The rural ethnic and livelihood structures of Sudan are so complex and area-specific that any summary of the issue of resource competition on a national scale is, by definition, a gross simplification. For instance, traditional pastoralist and agricultural societies in Sudan are not always clearly separated: in many areas, societies (families, clans and even whole tribes) practice a mixture of crop-growing and animal-rearing.

**Consolidating the State**

Every single political crisis in Sudan since the mid-1970s has been directly related to a financial crisis at the centre of state power and a struggle to control state revenues and parallel sources of finance. In each case the core problem was insufficient funds available to finance either the war effort or the patronage machine. In each case the ruler has used short-term stratagems of rent-seeking (including running up debts) or predation to secure the necessary funds, usually reconfiguring political alliances in order to secure the money. Those with least finance on offer—such as the Southerners—are repeatedly and doubly disadvantaged by these manoeuvres, because they are marginalized in the governing coalition and are subject to the depredations of those who are well-placed.

The combination of a financial system based on plunder and rent-seeking and the unstable politics of unresolved competition to control these plunder and rents have locked Sudan into protracted turbulence. Successive leaders of Sudan had the choice between using outright repression or cutting bargains with those elites in which the state put its institutions at the service of private interests. Nimeiri and Bashir both tried the first, briefly, and it didn’t work. The second is standard practice. One fundamental challenge facing Sudan is reconstituting the finances of the central government in such a way that the country’s commercial elites have a vested interest in stable and productive peripheries.
"Brute Causes"

In addition to the four hypotheses outlined above, Alex de Waal also discussed the so-called ‘brute causes’ approach, which – contrary to a focus on root causes – concentrates on how and why political and social conflict becomes violent. According to de Waal, there are three main variants of this approach:

Because of the difficulty in obtaining a consensus for any policy that is proactive and constructive, the default option prevails, which is to allow those groups within the power structure that are ready to act, to have a free hand to deal with the immediate manifestations of the problem without regard to the long-term consequences. This structure feature of Sudanese governance would then lead to a pattern whereby the most ruthless and/or opportunistic individuals repeatedly hold the initiative.

War creates war. Wars result in plentiful availability of small arms and men trained in their use. On the demand side, previous wars and nearby wars create motives for armed conflict. Every war and every peace deal leaves a legacy of unresolved grievance.

Most potent of all is the interaction between demand and supply. A military entrepreneur in a powerful position can create the demand for and manage supply of the means of violence, gaining political clout and material benefit. The threshold for initiating armed conflict is lowered

Gender Issues

A number of constraints continue to challenge the implementation of women's rights, including patriarchal customs and continuous conflict between written law and customary/religious laws, according to the UN Development Fund for Women (UNIFEM).

In the ongoing Darfur crisis, women and girls remain vulnerable to sexual attacks in remote areas when they go out to fetch water or take their wares to the market, according to Human Rights Watch (HRW).

Regarding the protection of women's rights, Sudan has not ratified the UN Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

LOCAL ISSUES

Eastern Sudan

Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement

After about 10 years of low-intensity guerrilla warfare in Eastern Sudan, during which the eastern rebels allied themselves with the SPLA and the Darfur rebels and received support from Eritrea, the GoS and the Eastern Front, composed of the Beja Congress and the Rashaida Free Lions, signed the Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement on 14 October 2006. Eritrea mediated the negotiations and hosted the signing and celebration of the Agreement.
The Agreement reflects the principles agreed upon in both the CPA and the DPA and highlights the concepts of a united, independent and sovereign State, one that is multi-cultural, multi-religious, multi-lingual and multi-racial, and where the recognition and respect for diversity are the basis for national cohesion. Respect and promotion of human rights, political pluralism, peaceful transition of power through fair and free elections, and sustainable development are fundamental within a federal system of government with equal and effective participation of women.

Background to Agreement

The predominant characteristics of the Eastern region (Red Sea State, Kassala State and El-Gedaref State) are ethnic diversity and political and economic marginalization. Like other peripheral regions of the Sudan, the majority of Eastern people have been neglected by the central government and isolated from economic and political participation due to the domination of the Sudanese state since independence by riverine-based elites.

With a population of nearly 4 million, principally low-density rural inhabitants that are pastoralists or agro-pastoralists, the region displays an uneven distribution of wealth. The economy is based primarily on large-scale agriculture and the activities of Port Sudan, where an oil pipeline terminates its trajectory across the Eastern States. Both are significant sources of state revenue and make the East one of the country’s wealthier regions. However, although these economic activities profit the few who own the farms and port companies and provide a steady income for employees, they represent little benefit to the nomads and small-scale farmers in the rural areas. The Red Sea State has one of the highest levels of poverty in the country, with a per capita income of just $93 in 2004, according to one household survey.278

Agricultural schemes have a long history in Eastern Sudan, where the Tokar delta has been planted with cotton since the 1860s, and the British established the Gash scheme in 1924 and the Ghamdambaliya scheme in Gedaref in 1945.279 Although these large mechanized farming projects provide considerable income for certain sectors they have also undermined traditional lifestyles and migration routes resulting in a weakened capacity of the tribal nomads to survive the fluctuations of their environment and ecosystem, such as the major droughts and famine occurring over the past two decades.280 Pastures and livestock have been decimated and food insecurity and chronic poverty have reached crisis proportions.281

Social and Ethnic composition

The major ethnic groups of the Eastern Sudan are the Beja, who are pastoralists or agro-pastoralists and include the Bishariyyah, Hadendwa, Amar'ar/Atmaan people, the Beni Amer, often included among the Beja, however with different linguistic roots and cultural characteristics who reside on both sides of the Eritrea / Sudan border, and the Rashaida, Bedouins who entered Sudan from the Northern Arabian Peninsula during the 19th century and still move across the borders as traders and/or smugglers.282

The Shukriyya, farmers and pastoralists who were granted land by the King of Sinnar during the Funj kingdom (1504-1821), are currently the largest Arab tribes in Gedaref. The urban areas of Kassala, Port Sudan and Gedaref have mixed populations where Sudanese from Khartoum and other parts of the
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country have migrated, many of whom are government administrators and businessmen. A strong urban / rural divide exists, ethnically, socially, politically and economically.

**Political background**

The Beja Congress was established in the 1950’s and has since been an active political force in the region with changing alliances over the years between the DUP and the NDA, and evolving into an armed force in the 1990s. The Eastern Front was formed in 2005 when the Beja Congress joined forces with Rashaida Free Lions. Although the Beja Congress was inherently a political organization reticent to resort to arms there was a strong feeling in the East that as democratic institutions were non-existent and the NCP would not allow change through political channels, it would have to be fought for militarily.283

The Wali’s, or Governors, of the states are not elected locally but are appointed by the central government. They therefore do not represent the majority population nor are they accountable to those they are meant to represent. The tribes have their own traditional structures and authorities, or Nazirs, who interact politically with the Walis as well as resolving conflicts among the tribes.

**Regional Dynamics**

The struggles in Eastern Sudan have involved a wider participation than just the signatories to the ESPA, in part due to alliances with the National Democratic Alliance (NDA). According to some analysts in 2005, Eritrea supported the JEM in establishing a presence in Eastern Sudan with about 2,000 troops, mainly Darfurian migrants resident in Gedarif. However with the signing of the ESPA the Eritreans requested the withdrawal of JEM forces.284

Looking more broadly at the Horn of Africa, the enduring volatile political situation in Somalia is a real threat not only to the ESPA, but to the stability in the whole region. Ethiopia, Eritrea and Sudan are involved in the Somali situation, and these countries are vital for political and military stability in the region. Analysts285 have claimed the ESPA was largely a bi-product of a larger process of reconciling the governments of Sudan and Eritrea and restructuring the security architecture of the Horn.

The unpredictable relationship between Sudan and Eritrea also constitutes a threat to the ESPA. Since 1993, Sudan-Eritrean relations have experienced periods that bordered on open war at various stages.286

For almost 45 years since the Eritrean Liberation Front (ELF) launched an armed struggle on what was then the Sudanese-Ethiopian border, regimes in Khartoum, Addis Ababa and later Asmara have supported one another’s dissidents. The ESPA calls for an end to the support but it will be some time before it can be ascertained whether the commitment to that provision is sincere. Experience in the Horn of Africa is that even when governments stop supporting each other’s dissidents, they do not disband them, understanding only too well how quickly conditions and relations can change. Moreover, given the widespread allegations that the NCP has not followed through on its commitments under the CPA and the DPA, where it is confronting much stronger armed groups, there are doubts as to its sincerity in implementing the ESPA.287

---
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Current Status of Peace Agreement

The principal merit of the agreement is that it brought the war to an end and averted a more serious humanitarian crisis in Eastern Sudan. However, eighteen months after the signing little progress has been made towards its implementation. According to insiders, internal debates within the Eastern Front delayed the naming of officials to enter government posts. According to the UN Secretary-General (S/2007/500), only after high level bi-lateral discussions in Asmara, three leaders of the Eastern Front were appointed to senior level posts in the GoNU in May 2007, and in June of that year others were appointed as deputies to the National Assembly. Although the Parties acknowledged in January 2008 (S/2008/64) that implementation mechanisms had been established and the Eastern Sudan Rehabilitation Fund would begin executing projects in 2008, it was also noted that full implementation of the agreement would require further work. According to news reports, in March 2008, the Eastern Sudan Rehabilitation Fund Board, chaired by the GoS, approved a number of projects to be implemented through 2008. The GoS committed to implement the relevant ESPA provisions and had 275 million Sudanese Dinar budgeted for 2008.

Concerns expressed over the ESPA revolve around the issues of the inclusion of Gedaref State in the same categories as the Red Sea and Kassala States, the absence of clear modalities for implementation of the agreement and representation of the different ethnic groups in political office. Many groups in Gedaref resent giving the Hadendowa, Beni Amir and Rashaida (marginal in Gedaref in terms of numbers) greater power than that of other significant groups. Suggestions have been made for the creation of an East-East Dialogue to bridge ethnic divisions and rivalries created first by the war, and then by the peace process.

Other analysts question how the $600m development fund can be equitably managed by a board chaired by NCP, and that a necessary focus of a democratic process should be voting out the NCP - if and when elections are permitted.

Some observers note the absence of international or regional powers as guarantors of the ESPA and believe that without international participation there is no guarantee that the government will abide by the provisions of the Agreement. The agreement was brokered by Eritrea, which hosted and facilitated the negotiations. There are already some who argue that Eritrea pressured the Eastern Front to sign. However others believe that due to antipathy felt by the NCP and the Eritrean government towards the United Nations and the USA, their exclusion made it possible to sign these agreements within the relatively short time frame they did.

Although regional and national elections are stipulated in the CPA, there is growing concern that the lack of interest demonstrated by the NCP and the SPLM in the elections might jeopardize whether or not they will take place as scheduled, and if they will be free and fair. The success of the ESPA is dependent upon democratic transformation, and many believe, an electoral defeat of the NCP. According to some, the signing of this agreement may extend the life of the government for a few years. Not only does the achievement of another peace agreement marginally increase the stature and legitimacy of the NCP, and demonstrate its responsiveness to international and SPLM/A pressures, it also eases tensions with Eritrea and has permitted the transfer of troops from the East to Darfur. The Eritrean government was also a major beneficiary of the agreement through limiting the numbers of the SAF in the East and to disband.
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the SAF allied armed groups along the Eritrean border. Security has been elevated on this front at a moment when tensions continue between Ethiopia and Eritrea. The open border should also ease economic pressures in the country.295

Kordofan

In her analysis of stability and development in Southern Kordofan, Sara Pantuliano identified both structural and immediate causes. Pantuliano considers the most important structural causes to be the following:

Land access: The problem of land ownership, access and use rights was deferred by the CPA to the post-agreement phase through the Southern Kordofan Land Commission. The Commission has however not been set up and land conflicts are rife in the region, exacerbated by the arrival or returning IDPs and refugees.

Political marginalization: The feeling of lack of genuine representation has always been pervasive amongst Nuba communities, who often describe themselves as 'second class citizens'. This feeling continues today amongst groups which supported the uprising and is fuelled by a perception that the integration of the SPLM alongside the NCP in the state government in Kadugli is far from genuine. On December 30, 2009, the National Assembly attempted to address this issue. It passed the People’s Consultation Act that would allow the people of South Kordofan and Blue Nile State to vote on whether or not they wanted more autonomy. The legislation, however, does not fully clarify what autonomy would mean for the residents of South Kordofan and Blue Nile State.296

Economic marginalization: Southern Kordofan has historically suffered from lack of basic services, acute underdevelopment, disproportionate economic marginalization and rampant poverty. Very little progress has been made since the signing of the CPA. The lack of a tangible peace dividend has created widespread resentments against the Government of National Unity in Kadugli.

Identity issues: The process of Arabization and Islamization implemented by successive central governments exacerbated feelings of racial, cultural and religious discrimination which already prevailed amongst Nuba communities in the 1980s. Furthermore, the creation of tribal militia has produced ethnic cleavages and fostered deep-seated enmities which will take many decades to heal.

Several observers have pointed out that the "three areas" protocol of the CPA, as well as its aftermath, have created immense resentment and controversy among many Kordofan residents. As Kordofan continues to suffer from an attention deficit, and without peace dividends, the dangers of renewed violent conflict and humanitarian crisis in the region are real and acute.297

The implementation of the CPA in Southern Kordofan has been subject to numerous delays, in particular as regards the formation of the state government and institutions. The lack of integration between the NCP and SPLA at various levels of state government has solidified the existence of parallel mechanisms and institutions and fostered the progressive isolation of former SPLM areas, which have turned into separate cantonments and has hampered relief and recovery efforts, complicated by limitations on freedom of movement of government authorities and NGOs. The massive return of IDPs and refugees (an
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estimated 600,000 throughout the region) has exacerbated the lack of services and infrastructure in these areas.298

Delays in the redeployment of forces and the proliferation of armed militia have also weakened stability in the area. Some SPLA units have moved south of the 1-1-56 line and others have gone to assembly areas to await ‘redeployment’, but many still remain in former SPLM strongholds within Southern Kordofan. The integration of Other Armed Groups (OAG) such as the PDF into the SAF also continues to create tension, as the PDF demands absorption into the SAF and compensation for the years of fighting alongside the Sudanese army. There is a perception that both the SAF and the SPLA are arming local groups, respectively Arab nomads and the Nuba people.299

The International Crisis Group, in its recent full fledged report on the situation in South Kordofan warned that both Nuba and Misseriya communities have become increasingly intolerant and frustrated at their marginalization by the CPA parties and the lack of peace dividends, to the extent that they could well resort to armed insurgencies if their needs are not met soon.300

In response to the volatile situation in the region, UNMIS has re-aligned its force and established a strengthened presence in Southern Kordofan and Abyei, improved security of the El Obeid Logistics Base through the deployment of a quick reaction force, and extended monitoring and verification activities through the establishment of new team sites.301

Northern Sudan

Much like the other peripheral regions of Sudan, groups in northern Sudan have long had their grievances with Khartoum, driven by the familiar claims of political and economic marginalisation. Nubian leaders claim their culture is at risk and want help resisting "Arabization" policy from Khartoum.302

In northern Sudan the government moved forward with construction of two major hydropower dams in Merowe and Kajbar, despite protests from local communities and human rights campaigners. The Merowe dam was officially inaugurated by President Bashir in March 2009. The construction of the Merowe dam has already displaced over 10,000 people, and has been hotly contested by the Manassir and the neighbouring Amri and Hamadab. All three communities will lose their traditional homelands. Numerous negotiations have failed to address adequately their demands for resettlement and compensation, leading to tension and clashes in which civilians have been killed and arrested by security forces.303

The second project is further north, around Kajbar, which will affect thousands more and threatens to submerge parts of the ancient Nubian homeland, much of which was already lost when Egypt completed the Aswan High Dam in 1964. It faces near unanimous opposition from the Nubian community.304 The
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evolving situation and human rights and humanitarian concerns are highlighted in the regular reporting by
the UN Secretary-General on Sudan to the Security Council.\footnote{United Nations, Report of the Secretary-General on the Sudan, S/2009/61, dated 30 January 2009.}

**Human Rights Issues**

The human rights situation in Sudan, and in particular in the Darfur region, continues to be catastrophic. Throughout the country violations are systemic, with many incidents of arbitrary detentions, ill-treatment and torture, unfair trials and the absence of freedom of expression.

On 28 November 2008, the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights reported on human rights violations committed by security forces and both aligned and non-aligned militias in Southern Sudan and Darfur, implicating them in extrajudicial killings; torture, rape, and other cruel, inhumane treatment or punishment by security forces; arbitrary arrest and detention; interference with the judiciary and denial of due process; obstruction of the delivery of humanitarian assistance; and restrictions on freedoms of speech, press, assembly, association, religion, and movement. Security forces and militia were also accused of harassment of IDPs; violence and discrimination against women; child abuse, including sexual violence and recruitment of child soldiers, particularly in Darfur; discrimination and violence against ethnic minorities; and forced labor, including child labor, by security forces and both aligned and non-aligned militias in Southern Sudan and Darfur.\footnote{See: Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights (OHCHR), Tenth Periodic Report of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights on the Situation of Human Rights in Sudan, Arrest and Detention Committed by National Security, Military and Police, Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 28 November 2008.}

The large scale and ongoing grave and systematic violations of human rights and international humanitarian law in Darfur are well documented, with numerous reports of very serious human rights violations and abuses.\footnote{See: United Nations, Report of the Secretary General on the Deployment of the African Union-United Nations Hybrid Operation in Darfur, 2009/83, 10 February 2009.} Victims of sexual and physical violence often described their attackers as members of the Sudanese Armed Forces or armed militias, with the great majority of the violent crimes going unpunished as arrests and prosecution of perpetrators are rare. The UN has accused Sudanese security forces of indiscriminate and disproportionate use of force, resulting in the killing of civilians.\footnote{See: OHCHR, Eleventh Periodic Report of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights on the Situation of Human Rights in the Sudan (Killing and Injuring of Civilians on 25 August 2008 by Government Security Forces: Kalma IDP camp, South Darfur Sudan), 23 January 2009.} In Khartoum, the Sudanese national intelligence and security service (NISS), military intelligence and police have been found responsible for human rights violations, including arbitrary arrests, torture and use of excessive force. Political detainees, Darfuris and others from marginalized areas, as well as students are routinely subjected to ill-treatment. The SPLM and Northern opposition parties have called upon the NCP to end the NISS’s power of arrest and seizure. The NCP did introduce and pass legislation on December 20, 2009 that would reform the security and intelligence service. However, it fell short of the opposition’s demands and simply limited the amount of time the NISS could detain suspects.\footnote{Reuters, “Sudan Passes Security Bill Despite Protests,” Dec. 20, http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/HEA056484.htm. Accessed 12/21/2009.}

At least 10,000 inhabitants of the northern Nile valley were forcibly evicted from their homes and land as water levels rose after the closure of the Merowe hydropower dam in July 08. Residents who remained in the area had opposed governmental relocation plans. They were not offered alternative housing in line with the agreement they had reached with the authorities, and have received neither compensation nor adequate humanitarian assistance.
assistance. Demonstrations are regularly met with excessive force and in June 2008, during a peaceful
march in connection with protests against the Kajbar Dam in Northern Sudan the police killed four
demonstrators and arrested dozens of others. Detainees, including journalists, were held incommunicado
for up to 10 weeks and warned not to report on the subject. In December 2009, demonstrations led to
the arrest of high-level opposition leaders. Protestors took to the streets over a law passed by the NCP
without the consultation of the SPLM and other opposition parties that insufficiently limited the power of
the NISS. Police arrested, among many others, Pagan Amum, the SPLM Secretary-General, and Abbas
Juma, a SPLM representative in the parliament and Minister of the Interior. The government also
outlawed demonstrations, claiming that they threatened Sudan’s security and stability.

Political repression in Sudan is routine. In July 2008, the President of the Umma Party Reform and
Renewal and other political figures were arrested with supporters, including many former army officers,
and accused of planning a coup. The authorities issued an order forbidding the press to discuss the
matter in the press. Similarly, Hassan al-Turabi, the leader of the Popular Congress Party, has been
arrested on numerous occasions. Most recently, Sudanese security officers arrested Turabi on January 14,
two days after he urged Bashir to surrender to the ICC, saying he thought the head of state was
"politically culpable" for crimes committed in conflict-ridden Darfur.

The GoS also continues with its harsh policy of clearing "slums" that house families fleeing to Khartoum in
search of security and employment. Numerous previous clearances have steadily pushed primarily non-
Arab populations further from the centre of Khartoum, now to locations that are over 20 kilometres south
of the capital.

In Southern Sudan, clashes between different militias continued, often resulting in killings of civilians or
abductions. People continue to be arbitrarily detained, sometimes as hostages for other family members.
Partly because of a shortage of lawyers, many people have been convicted without defence lawyers. A
number of death sentences were passed but no judicial executions were known to have been carried
out.

Civilian Insecurity

During the past four or five years, the issue of civilian insecurity or protection was more often raised in
the context of the war in Sudan’s Darfur region, and understandably so given the dramatic humanitarian
emergency that has unfolded there since 2003. Civilians in southern Sudan and the transition areas,
however, also face challenges and threats to their well-being, if not lives. This sub-section provides a
brief overview of some of the more pressing security concerns for civilians in southern Sudan, including
the three transition areas, and in Darfur along with their related consequences on the well-being and
safety of these populations. Many of these issues are discussed in greater detail in the mission-specific
sections, so this overview is meant to set the stage for those later sections.

Southern Sudan
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Southern Sudan’s security landscape is extremely fragile. According to many observers, the South has become more deadly than Darfur leading the International Crisis Group to define Southern Sudan as a possible failed state. The highest profile threat facing civilians in southern Sudan’s border areas with Uganda and the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) come from the long-standing presence of the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA). Recently, this threat has grown more deadly. In September 2008, LRA attacked villages in the DRC and an SPLA camp in Sakure, Western Equatoria State, killing two civilians and abducting 14, including 12 children. Their attacks intensified in the weeks before their leader, Joseph Kony, was scheduled to sign a peace agreement but did not appear (the third such failed attempt). In December 2008, the Ugandan army, supported by the Central African Republic, Congolese and Southern Sudanese armies launched a coordinated offensive, Operation Lightning Thunder, against the rebels. The operation, however, had little effect and attacks continued. Since December of 2008, LRA attacks have killed 200 civilians and have displaced roughly 68,000 people. These attacks forced the UN to suspend all relief in the South along the Sudan-Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) border after 29 humanitarian workers were forced to evacuate by helicopter and 27 UN barges carrying food were attacked.

External rebel movements are not the only armed forces civilians in Southern Sudan need to be worried about. Very weak rule of law institutions and insufficient attention by GoSS authorities to rule of law issues have given rise to an environment of impunity, particularly for soldiers who view themselves as “liberators” of the South and above the law. In this environment, soldiers and other security forces commit serious crimes, often opportunistically, against civilians. The crimes include beatings, robbery, intimidation, land-grabbing, and sexual violence. Soldiers and renegade soldiers from the SPLA also contribute to insecurity with infighting or by crimes against civilians for personal gain. The Southern Sudan Police Service (SSPS) lacks resources and training to effectively provide security. In their absence, GoSS officials, who are almost all former military themselves, turn to SPLA soldiers to manage security threats. The soldiers are untrained in civilian law enforcement and often undisciplined.

On a general level, all civilians would be vulnerable to the risks inherent in the collapse of the CPA and a resumption of war between the North and South. In this light, the slow and uneven pace of CPA implementation is a particular long-term concern and highly symbolic measures such as the behind-schedule creation of Joint Integrated Units are worrying indicators.

In more immediate terms, civilians in the three transitional areas remain under more urgent threats from unfinished unresolved issues from the CPA process. In this part of the country, North-South tensions fuel a simmering tensions and outright conflict over the disputed areas of the 1956 border, such as oil-rich Abyei. Tensions between the parties to the CPA increased after the northern National Congress Party rejected the finding of a boundaries commission, formed in accordance with the Abyei Protocol of the CPA. The commission found that the ethnically southern Dinka Ngok communities had a legitimate claim.
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to the area of Abyei and adjacent oil fields. Following SAF and SPLA troop build-ups and months of skirmishes in the area, clashes between the two forces erupted in May 2008, killing scores of civilians and causing at least 60,000 to flee from their homes.

In addition to these "uniformed" threats emanating from Sudanese security forces or attacks by the LRA, many southerners' security and livelihoods are affected by localized communal fighting, often linked to competition over land, livestock, or other resources. Since January 2009, communal and tribal fighting has increased exponentially leaving 2500 civilians dead and 350,000 more displaced. The worst fighting has taken place in Jonglei between the Dinka, Lou Nuer, Jikany Nuer, and Murle communities. Conflicts in the South are fuelled by weapons that have remained in the hands of civilians since the civil war and by rebel groups who manage to circumvent the arms embargo. The GoSS has not adequately disarmed militias and soldiers in the SAF, SPLA, and the Joint Integrated Units (JIU) have sold ammunition to civilians in the South.

Armed criminal groups and renegade soldiers with unknown affiliations also present security threats in many parts of Southern Sudan, committing various abuses against civilians. For example, according to a report issued by the Southern Sudan Legislative Assembly's Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs Committee, groups of renegade soldiers known as "forgotten warriors" attacked civilians in Upper Nile, looting homes and raping females. Large numbers of underpaid soldiers who lack training in their peacetime police-oriented role also represent a threat to security by committing human rights abuses and other crimes. Meanwhile, communal conflict persists in the form of cattle rustling and inter-communal conflict over land use and ill-defined payam and county boundaries.

Regardless of the source of the insecurity, the consequences are depressingly familiar for civilians. People are still dying violent deaths in the South or are seriously injured and the long-term health of people is weakened. Economic development and recovery are stunted or blocked altogether in some of the most desperate parts of Sudan as the United Nations and NGOs have either suspended or scaled back their relief efforts because of violence. Residents and returning refugees are unable to settle and rebuild their lives and the number of displaced civilians has returned to civil war levels. This is not a viable foundation for long-term peace and development in Sudan.

The GoSS and many impartial observers blame the current instability on the North. During the civil war, Khartoum was able further its own interests by pitting Southerners against Southerners. The current instability in the South does benefit the NCP who want both a weakened SPLM and a delayed or cancelled referendum on independence. However, the International Crisis Group released a report in December 2009 that claimed there was little evidence that links instability in the South to the NCP. The group instead pointed to the GoSS's inability to extend its authority and provide security.

Regardless of who is responsible for the increased violence, instability in the South seriously threatens the CPA as Sudan moves towards national elections that have been postponed again until April 2010 and a 2011 referendum that many think will lead to independence.

**Darfur**

Sudanese civilians living in the three Darfur states have lived in dangerous and harsh conditions since the outbreak of the war in 2003. As conflict has evolved over the past six years, very few people in Darfur have been immune to the various sources of danger and violence that have plagued this troubled region of Sudan.

The danger comes in a number of forms and has affected people living both inside and outside IDP camps. Direct causes of insecurity include the war itself, in which thousands of civilians have died, and its related off-shoots such as increased criminality, heightened tribal/ethnic tensions and increased cross-border violence between Chad and Sudan. For the civilian populations living in the dozens of IDP camps throughout the Darfur states, insecurity is not lessened because of the easy accessibility to the camps enjoyed by both government and rebel agents and the threats camp residents (especially women) face when they venture out of the camps for food or fuel collection.

Indirectly, the war has threatened the health and well-being of civilians through the loss of regular food sources, health care, homes and livelihoods, the damage done to the local economy. Cumulatively, these consequences of the war have taken far more lives than the war’s targeted violence and ensure that the civilian populations who initially survived raids or battles may face equally lethal threats in the aftermath regardless if they manage to stay in their homes or join the ranks of IDPs so long as the conflict continues.

**UNAMID ISSUES**

As the deployment of UNAMID continues, the mission’s leadership and planners face a remarkably complex operational and political environment. Many of these factors were touched on in the ‘Background’ section. This section is meant to provide more details related to factors that warrant additional consideration. It ends with a brief discussion of the prospects for UNAMID’s success.

**Deployment**

While the pace of UNAMID’s deployment has increased over the past year, the timely deployment of all its components throughout its area of operations remains a significant challenge. Over two and a half years since its deployment began, the mission has reached only 77 per cent of its mandated strength for military personnel (15,114 of out of 19,555 personnel), 66 per cent of its police strength (4,280 of a mandated strength of 6,432) and 61 per cent of authorized civilian staff (3,410 out of 5,557). However, some critical contingents have arrived with specialized equipment that are crucial to UNAMID’s mandate.

---

and this should bolster deployment efforts. The challenges that remain, however, are numerous and
varied. Increased violence in 2009 has hampered UNAMID’s civilian deployment. Fewer staff members are
staying in Sudan after their initial contracts expire and fewer applicants are applying for vacancies and
accepting job offers.330

Obstruction by the Sudanese government

Objections and delays by the Sudanese government have threatened the success of the mission from the
beginning. In what seems to have been a pattern of deliberate obstruction, Sudan rejected the initial list
troop contributing countries, failed to provide sufficient land for the construction of facilities, delayed
entrance visas refused night flights, delayed customs procedures and did not provide sufficient security for
equipment travelling through territories it controls. Because of the increased pace of deployment, the UN
reported that Khartoum has been more cooperative since 2008. However, Khartoum’s decision to support
UNAMID is often not followed locally in Darfur.331 The UN reports, however, that Khartoum was more
cooperative during the last few months of 2008 and that this, in part, was a factor in the increased pace of
deployments during the same time frame. Some of this improved atmosphere around deployment issues
might be credited to the new Tripartite Committee for the Deployment of UNAMID (comprising GNU, the
AU and UN). It proved useful after only a few meetings by helping to reach agreement on some issues,
yet the future of GNU cooperation is a concern in the aftermath of the ICC arrest warrant for President
Bashir.332

Critical mission capabilities

Despite ongoing efforts, critical capabilities such as helicopters and reconnaissance units are still lacking.
According to some analysts, many potential troop contributing countries hesitate to make such capabilities
available because they are not confident enough that UNAMID’s strategy and concept of operations are
sound. Most importantly, neither Khartoum nor the rebels appear to want an end to the fighting.

DPKO performance

DPKO has been accused of failing to secure contracts with multi-role logistics companies that would
provide sustainment services for military and police units. Also, it has been urged to work more quickly to
build camps and barracks for additional troops, and to demonstrate flexibility in considering technical
specifications for helicopters.

Other factors

The deployment of critical enabling units has been delayed because of slow movement of equipment from
Port Sudan to Darfur by road, due in large part to insecurity and the relatively limited number of local
contractors. Banditry along supply lines is causing local contractors to refuse to transport assets of the
mission.

Regional Dimension
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Darfur is geographically situated between the central African countries, the Horn of Africa and the Gulf States. It also straddles the terrain between the northern Arab peoples and the African populations. Such a location has created through the centuries a natural crossroads of migrating nomads, traders and religious pilgrims travelling to Mecca. Dar Fur was an independent state for three centuries until it was brought under British rule in 1916. It was one of the most powerful kingdoms among other such states on the southern edge of the Sahara desert, trading with Egypt and other Mediterranean countries, while raiding southern neighbours.333

The tribal peoples of the region have lived there long before international borders were established therefore many of the tribes such as the Zaghawa, the Gimr and the Tama resident today in Darfur also consider the neighbouring countries as part of their traditional territory. Economics, politics and the struggle for power have all contributed to the fluctuating interdependence and fleeting loyalties between the varied regimes of the region, while conflict, drought and famine have precipitated massive displacements of populations across borders.

Annual migration routes for the nomadic herders of Darfur range up to 800 km between the extreme northern and southerly points and do not recognize the borders with Chad and CAR. Trading routes continue to include the 40-day road from Darfur to the markets of Egypt, the Libyan camel markets of Kufra and markets to the south and the west where, apart from the cows, sheep and goats, ground nuts, watermelon seeds, gum arabic and sesame have historically been the Darfurian commodities of trade with their neighbours.

The discovery of oil in Libya and the subsequent boom of the 1970s and 1980s, combined with Gaddafi’s open door policy encouraging African Unity and Pan-Arabism, favoured economic migration from Sudan. Migrations caused by famine had historically been common in Darfur, however, during the droughts of the 1980’s and the major famine of 1984-86, many Darfurians departed to Libya, Egypt and other Arab states in search of work and financial opportunities. They in turn sent remittance money back to their families in Darfur until 2003 when the conflict broke out. Remittances all but ceased, due to the displacement of the population and the subsequent breakdown in communications, to the insecurity that curtailed travel, and finally to the closure of the border between Sudan and Libya.334

Throughout the centuries, Islamic pilgrims have traversed Darfur en route to Mecca in completion of the Haj. Many of these pilgrims have settled in Darfur altering the ethnic and cultural composition of the area. Some people complain today that the traditional Darfurian ‘hospitality’ has hurt them as some of the many traders or pilgrims that they welcomed into their communities have now turned against them and taken their lands.

Exportation through-out the region of Arabist ideology from Gaddafi’s Libya, and Islamist ideology from the Muslim Brotherhood originating in Egypt and adopted by the NIF in Sudan has strongly influenced the countries of central Africa, the Horn and beyond. The Arabs of Darfur were led to believe from the Arab Gathering that they, as direct descendants of the Prophet, have the right to rule Muslim lands,335 and this supremacist concept continues to underlie the aggression of the Janjaweed not only in Darfur but also in Chad.

Eritrea has played an important role in the Darfur conflict by supporting both the JEM and SLM/A. As Sudan exported Islamist ideology west of Darfur it also supported jihadists in Eritrea, which in turn, supported most of the Sudanese rebel groups, including the Free Lions in eastern Sudan, opposing the government of Khartoum.
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These historic connections among the neighbouring countries of the region have led to political intrigue and competition over power and wealth in the region, and to open warfare at different periods of history. Tribal loyalties and political opportunism fuel the fluctuations of relations, while internal challenges also come together with regional dynamics to define the course of history. The current proxy war between Chad and Sudan is defined by the Zaghawa tribal loyalties as well as by Sudan’s desire to curb the Darfur insurgency. Sudan has therefore supported the Chadian armed opposition in order to replace Déby with a ‘Khartoum friendly’ regime; while Déby needs the Darfur insurgents to hold on to power in Chad. By August 2006, post-DPA, Sudan was also growing increasingly uneasy about an international intervention force arriving in Darfur and the expectation was that such a force would be based in Chad.336

Libya was a key player in the regional order before 1990 as Muammar Gaddafi attempted to exert an Arabist influence and create a Sahelian empire, planning to annex Chad and establish an ‘Arab Belt’ or corridor into central Africa. UN sanctions and the settlement of the Aouzou dispute with Chad in 1994 resulted in Tripoli lowering its profile, and in the recent years Gaddafi has become the apparent peacemaker with his varied attempts to reconcile the conflicted parties in both the Darfur peace process and the Sudan/Chad proxy war.

NIF Islamist policy laid the foundations for the Darfur war. From the 1980’s onward successive governments in Khartoum mobilized and armed Arab groups to carry out their policies and to attack and subdue populations they considered to be hostile, they supported the tribal militias and, in 1989, passed the Popular Defence Act which legalised the PDF. Local Arab leaders were also elevated in the ranks of the Native Administration and given Arab titles of Amir and Nazir in order to outrank the non-Arab groups of Darfur in local government. During the Fur-Arab war of 1987-1990 a coalition of 27 Arab groups were mobilized and armed by Libya with tacit agreement of Khartoum.337 The Sudanese government ignored Gaddafi using Darfur as a rear base for his wars in Chad as he brought thousands of Islamic Legion troops and Chadian Arabs across the desert to Darfur, while the Darfur population was abandoned to suffer the effects of a major drought without government assistance.338

The Chadian civil war initiated in 1965 with a peasant revolt became by the 1980’s, according to Marchal, a proxy confrontation between Libya and the Western powers. The Libyan military intervened in Chad to maintain a presence by offering support to Goukouni Oueddei against Habré. Meanwhile Habré was receiving support from Sudanese President Jaafar Nimeiri, and military aid from Egypt, France and the USA in order to expel Gaddafi from Chad. Habré, in 1982 finally managed to retake N’Djamena with direct support from France and Zaire. Operation Manta in 1983 later became Epervier, the French military presence in Chad did not prevent on-going confrontations within Chad however it did keep Gaddafi cornered from 1986 to 2007.339

Alliances changed and Déby came to power in 1990 with the support of the regimes in Khartoum and Tripoli and launched his coup against Hissen Habré from Darfur. In turn, Déby’s military support and Chadian mercenaries enabled the CAR coup by General Bozize in March 2003.340

More recently the war in Darfur has moved into Chad as refugees have fled across the border. Although exact figures are difficult to obtain estimates indicate approximately 400,000 Darfurians moved into Chad between 2003 and 2007. The flow has not been entirely one way as Janjaweed fighters crossed into Chad and Sudan.
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eastern Chad and attacked Chadian villages forcing about 30,000 Chadians over the border into Darfur. And in February 2008, around 4,000 Khartoum-supported rebels launched an attack from Darfur and fought their way to the Chadian capital, N'Djamena, in an attempt to overthrow President Déby. The apparent back and forth proxy conflict continued, in the view of Sudanese officials, when the JEM staged its assault on Omdurman in May 2008. Khartoum accused the Déby government of direct support to JEM for this attack and broke off diplomatic relations for roughly three months. On May 3, 2009, Sudan and Chad signed the "Good Neighbours Agreement". Both countries pledged to stop supporting armed opposition groups operating within the other's territory and agreed to renew their commitments to independent observation along the border. The agreement was upheld for 24 hours. The next day, the Union des Forces de la Resistance (UFR), a Sudanese-armed rebel group, crossed into Chad and attacked Chadian troops. Chad responded by crossing into Darfur in retaliation. Both sides have agreed to resume negotiations on the implementation of the "Good Neighbours Agreement" in Ndjamen on January 7, 2010.

It has become clear to most observers, that to bring peace to Darfur will require a broader regional approach that also takes into consideration the interconnectedness of the conflicts and interests in both Chad and the CAR, and such a process will need support from other actors that continue to exert influence through-out this region.

**Chronic Insecurity**

The Darfur conflict is notable for many reasons, but one of its more remarkable characteristics is the persistence and scope of chronic insecurity in the region and the threat this has posed to Darfur's civilians. Into 2009 - its seventh year - the Darfur conflict continues to exact a terrible toll on civilians and place enormous demands on those trying to provide humanitarian aid or implement the various peace deals.

**Causes**

The causes for this chronic insecurity are many. First, the conflict between the GoS and its various armed groups on one side and the rebels on the other continues with varying degrees of intensity. Second, there have been cases, especially since the signing of the DPA in May, 2006, of rebel groups battling each other for control of territory, resources or influence. The on-going process of fragmentation within the rebel movement has only aggravated the inter-rebel tensions and conflicts. Third, the constant movements and actions of rebel groups across the Chad-Sudan border are a highly destabilising factor, especially in West Darfur, but for civilians on both sides of the border. Fourth, a general lack of discipline among the government aligned militia groups and the rebels has been a chronic problem in all Darfur states. Groups of irregular fighters act outside any command structure, when the opportunity permits, to their personal gain, thus banditry has become a significant problem in Darfur, to say nothing of the usual criminal element that flourishes in such chaotic environments. Finally, with a lack of traditional dispute settlement mechanisms and government structures in many areas beyond government control, localised tribal disputes can erupt with little relationship to the broader conflict.

**Consequences**

---
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This combustible mix of factors has cost the civilian population of Darfur dearly. First, thousands of people of been killed in the fighting, and it appears that the vast majority of the victims were directly and intentionally targeted by the parties. In addition to those killed as a result of violence, there are many more who have died as a result of indirect causes, such as disease, hunger, thirst, exposure, lack of medical attention, etc, after being displaced by the fighting or having their livelihoods destroyed. The number of people who have died in this conflict is unknown, but various international estimates range up to 400,000 since 2003. As for gravely wounded civilians, the total number is unknown, but, this figure too is likely in the many thousands.

Second, the fighting has created thousands of Sudanese refugees, either in their own country or across the border in Chad. As of January 2009, the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in all three Darfur states was roughly 2.7 million while the number of displaced persons who sought refuge in Chad is close to 250,000. This large population of people is housed in dozens of IDP camps within Darfur and a dozen refugee camps inside Chad. Third, the on-going fighting and general insecurity makes it increasingly difficult for the aid effort to supply the camps properly or reach people in need who have not come to the camps.

Fourth, the chronic insecurity in Darfur and the accompanying atmosphere of impunity has led to widespread human rights abuses, especially against women. In keeping with recent trends in other wars of the past 15 years, systemic rape has emerged as a significant weapon against women. During one four and a half month period, one NGO reported treating 500 rape victims alone. It is clear from the available evidence that rape is being employed as a tool for spreading fear, humiliating the targeting group and intimidating victims not to return to their homes. Women have been attacked in and around their villages and inside and outside IDP camps.

Fifth, the insecurity has made it very difficult for people to engage in their livelihoods and sustain any semblance of a local economy. One report found that:

Never before in the history of Darfur has there been such a combination of factors causing the failure of livelihood strategies and the loss of assets. These factors include systematic asset-stripping, production failures, market failures, failures of access to natural resources and constraints on the remittances of migrant workers. Under these circumstances, region-wide famine appears inevitable. While the provision of food aid can partially redress production failures, a much wider raft of interventions is needed to begin to address the other issues.
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The loss of mobility, destroyed crops and fields, poisoned water wells, stolen livestock and the loss of markets add up to a near economic collapse. This disastrous situation will be a long and painful legacy of the chronic insecurity that has plagued Darfur since 2003.

**Peace process**

As of March 2008 security has deteriorated even further in Darfur, principally in West Darfur and along the Chadian border. Between December of 2007 and January 2008 both the Chadian regular forces and JEM launched attacks within Sudanese territory (S/2008/98). In February, the Sudanese armed forces bombed a number of villages north of El Geneina and around the strategic Jebel Moun, and ground attacks were led by the army and the Janjaweed militias claiming to rout out rebel forces. One week after AMIS transferred power to UNAMID the new mission suffered its first armed attack.

In February 2008, the United Nations expressed grave concern over the ongoing tensions between Chad and Sudan, and the impediment this conflict would be to achieving peace in Darfur if not resolved. And after Sudan-backed rebels determined to oust President Déby, they carried out an attack which reached the capital N’djamena. Senegal brokered an accord between Sudan and Chad to end hostilities. However, Chadian rebels publicly dismissed the agreement saying they would continue their campaign to overthrow Chad’s president. According to the UNAMID commander, without bringing the rebel forces into the negotiations any agreement signed will have doubtful success, and if the rebels continue to fight it will be unclear if the fighting is between the rebels and their government, or between the two countries with regional aspirations. This pact is the sixth signed in five years, demonstrating the fragility of such agreements.

Peace in Darfur has become a distant concept since the failure of the DPA of May 2006 and until fundamental issues are resolved it is unlikely to happen in the near future. The DPA ended any semblance of unity within or between the SLM/A and the JEM when major factions refused to sign the agreement. And since this time, the once strong rebel movement has been in a downward spiral of fragmentation. At one point in 2008, the United Nations recognized in its reporting five major groupings: the Sudan Liberation Army, (SLA) Unity, SLA Abdel Wahid, SLA Abdul Shafi, JEM Khalil Ibrahim and the United Resistance Front (URF) (S/2008/64), however other analysts claim the existence of anywhere from 12 to 27 different movements today in Darfur.351

In the post-DPA period, violence has escalated both on the part of the government forces and militias, now allied to the SLA signatories to the DPA led by Minni Minawi, and among the rebel groups themselves. This violence has had a horrific affect on the civilian population causing thousands of more people to flee their homes. Humanitarian efforts have been under siege for at least three years now, and Khartoum’s decision to target international NGOs for expulsion in the wake of the ICC arrest warrant decision on 4 March 2009 has clearly placed the humanitarian relief system under even greater strain. The NCP has softened its position on international aid organizations, but the long-term humanitarian situation in Darfur is still threatened by the expulsion of NGOs. The government and rebel groups have further complicated the humanitarian situation by restricting the movements of UNAMID and other UN agencies. Since January 2009, UNAMID has been prohibited from entering IDP camps by government officials on 42 occasions. The GoS repeatedly restricted UNAMID’s movements in areas where they had engaged rebels because of security concerns and the South Darfur government has increasingly asked to be kept apprised of UNAMID movements. In April, the NISS arrested and briefly detained two UNAMID officers. On several occasions JEM has also prohibited UNAMID patrols from entering villages under its control.352
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Although efforts to revitalize peace negotiations by the AU-UN Joint Chief Mediator for Darfur, Djibrill Bassolé, and the Government of Qatar resulted in a general agreement in February, 2009 between Khartoum and JEM on principles for moving talks forward, they suffered a setback when JEM announced it was suspending this nascent process over the decision to evict INGOs from Darfur a month later. Similarly, throughout 2008 efforts towards a unification of the movements met with mixed results leaving the rebels still fractured. The situation within the broader rebel movement remains fluid and the coalitions fragile making the search for a common negotiating position a very steep challenge. Since March, efforts to unify rebel groups have met some success. On March 15, SLM-Unity, SLM-Khamees, United Revolutionary Force Front, SLM-Juba, JEM-Azraq signed the Tripoli Charter and agreed to present a unified front at future negotiations in Doha. JEM eventually rejoined negotiations in May, but a final settlement has yet to be reached. Similarly, a final settlement has yet to be reached. Similarly, a final settlement has yet to be reached.

The importance of Sudan-Chad relations in the political calculations of the peace process deserves highlighting. Despite the restoration of diplomatic relations in between the two countries in August 2008, relations between Sudan and Chad continue to be tense and seemingly chronically at risk of falling back into a proxy war, if not a direct confrontation, between the two countries. Chadian rebels backed by Sudan have mounted numerous military attacks deep into Chad, twice reaching the national capital. Chadian president Déby is an active backer of Darfurian rebel groups and will not end this support unless his own political future is secure. ‘Given that Déby’s problems emerge as much from his own misrule as from Khartoum’s destabilization, and there is no peace process in Chad, a resolution to the Chadian crisis is not in sight.’

The Sudan’s Comprehensive Peace Agreement was signed on 9 January 2005 and, during the following sixteen months, African Union mediators in the Nigerian capital Abuja tried to broker an agreement between the Sudan government and the Darfur rebels that would both resolve Darfurian grievances while also buttressing the CPA. Deadlines were imposed on the process in order to facilitate the arrival of UN troops to replace the under resourced and inexperienced African Union peacekeeping mission in Darfur, and the U.S. pressured a signature of the peace deal. Instead of ceding to the pressures main factions of the rebel movement (SLM-Abdul Wahid and JEM) refused to sign.

According to the ICG, the DPA is a failure, too limited in scope and signatories. Those who signed, the government and one rebel faction (only Minni Minawi at this point), represented only about 10 percent of Darfurians at the time of signing, according to Tanner and Tubiana, (2007) and they have hurt the peace process. The ruling National Congress Party (NCP) is pursuing destructive policies in Darfur, while at the same time resisting compliance with key CPA provisions. The actions of the NCP are meant to secure their success in the 2009 elections if they happen. ‘The NCP wants Darfur in chaos to limit the room for an opposition to emerge, while resettling key allies on cleared land and defying Security Council resolutions by integrating its Janjaweed irregulars into official security structures instead of disarming them.’ Other initiatives have also been undertaken to revive the peace process, such as Libya’s Sirte Process in 2007. Yet, again, main rebel groups declined to attend and undermined the success of these efforts.

Darfur is the epicentre of three overlapping circles of conflict. First and foremost, there is the five-year-old war between the Darfur rebel movements and the government, which is part of the breakdown between Sudan’s centre, the NCP in Khartoum, which controls wealth and political power and the marginalised peripheries. Second, the Darfur conflict has triggered a proxy war that Chad and Sudan are fighting by
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hosting and supporting the other’s rebel groups. Finally, there are localised conflicts, primarily centred on land tensions between sedentary and nomadic tribes. The regime has manipulated these to win Arab support for its war against the mostly non-Arab rebels. International interests, not least the priority the USA has placed on regime assistance in its 'war on terrorism' and China's investment in Sudan's oil sector, have added to the difficulty in resolving the conflict.

In seeking solutions to the problems of Darfur the international community must consolidate a global position in dealing with the Sudan and international policies must no longer be bifurcated between the CPA and Darfur. Sudan’s multiple conflicts are outgrowths of a common set of national problems and need to be treated as such.

**ICC Process**

The conflict in Darfur, UNAMID’s deployment and operations and on-going efforts to re-start political talks to end the conflict all unfold with a profound debate providing the background noise: the genocide debate. Since the spring and summer of 2004, when reporters, civil society leaders and even senior UN officials (including Kofi Annan) began to making direct comparisons between the Darfur crisis and the Rwandan genocide, a tremendous amount of effort has been exerted to either prove or disprove the notion that what is happening in Darfur is genocide, with 'Arabs' as the perpetrators and 'Africans' the victims.357

The US government (in contrast to its reaction to the Rwandan case in 1994) came out strongly in the summer of 2004 with its conclusions that genocide was taking place in Darfur. The US Congress passed concurrent resolutions in July of that year declaring it genocide while the executive branch followed suit in early September through Colin Powell's widely-reported testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.358 For proponents of quick and forceful intervention in the crisis, however, the US declarations were not accompanied with such policy decisions. Apparently, there was no interest either in other western capitals or the Security Council to initiate any initiative to stop the killings as called for in the 1948 UN Convention against Genocide. Instead, the Council created and dispatched the International Commission of Inquiry (ICI) in September 2004 to investigate 'reports of violations of international humanitarian law and human rights law in Darfur by all parties, to determine also whether or not acts of genocide have occurred, and to identify the perpetrators of such violations with a view to ensuring that those responsible are held accountable.'359

The ICI submitted its report in January 2005 and concluded, in general terms, that while 'the government had not followed a policy of genocide,' there was abundant evidence of wide-spread and serious violations of international humanitarian law and that the burden of responsibility rested heavily with the GoS and its associated militia and (to a less extent) with the rebel groups.360 In submitting its report to the Secretary-General, the ICI also handed over a sealed envelope with the names of 51 individuals that the ICI believed should be the focus of follow-on investigations for war crimes and breaches of humanitarian law and that the Council should refer these cases to the International Criminal Court (ICC).

In adopting Security Council Resolution 1593 on 31 March 2005, the Council took the advice of the ICI report and referred to the ICC the responsibility for investigating and prosecuting cases that arise out of the Darfur crisis. Subsequent to SCR 1593, the ICC Prosecutor issued arrest warrants on 27 April 2007 for
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two Sudanese nationals in connection with atrocities in Darfur. The two men facing arrest are Ali Muhammad Ali Abd-Al-Rahman ("Ali Kushayb"), an alleged Janjaweed leader, and Ahmad Muhammad Harun ("Ahmad Harun"), a former Minister of State for the Interior who had responsibilities for security in Darfur during the early stages of the conflict. So far, the GoS has refused to surrender the men to the ICC and no hearing dates are scheduled.361

In July 2008, the ICC’s chief prosecutor sought the issue of an arrest warrant for President Omar Hassan al-Bashir on suspicion of crimes against humanity. Some diplomats have expressed concern that a formal indictment of Bashir could damage the stalled peace process aimed at ending the conflict in Darfur. Similarly, peacekeeping officials fear that an arrest warrant against Bashir could prompt a wave of violence against UNAMID or even prompt Khartoum to order all international peacekeepers in Sudan out of the country. In September 2008, France suggested it could support suspending an international indictment of Sudan’s president for war crimes if Khartoum met several conditions including ending the killings in Darfur. Sudan, the African Union, Arab League and other alliances have urged the U.N. Security Council to use its powers under Article 16 of the ICC statute to block any proceedings against Bashir to avoid shattering the fragile peace process in Darfur. France and the UK have agreed to support a Security Council resolution that defers al-Bashir’s arrest warrant if the Sudanese Government agrees to implement fully the CPA and change its Darfur policy. The United States has yet committed to supporting a deferral.362

The issue came to head on 4 March 2009 when the ICC’s Pre-trial Chamber I issued an arrest warrant for President Bashir for the alleged crimes against humanity and war crimes, but not genocide as the Chief Prosecutor had alleged.363 Not surprisingly, President Bashir and his government have rejected the warrant and have begun a campaign to rally support from allies and other states suspicious of the ICC. The expulsion of INGOs from Darfur was an immediate consequence of the decision as Bashir accused these groups as providing information to the ICC and as such they were spies acting against the interests of Sudan but the longer term political consequences are thus far unclear. JEM’s statement that it was pulling out of peace talks with GoS over the INGO expulsion issue may bode ill for future prospects for the peace process but for now we can only say that it is short-term setback.

The genocide debate and the involvement of the ICC have not moved key governments or the Security Council to take forceful action to attempt to stop the conflict, despite the ever louder calls from western civil society to do so. For UNAMID, this issue has complicated its work in a three ways. First, the on-going debate, the work of the ICI and now the ICC put the GoS in a very defensive posture that has at times left it less inclined to be a cooperative partner in facilitating UNAMID’s deployment. Second, the controversy surrounding the genocide debate, and who might be targeted with arrest warrants and why, has served to aggravate the already dangerous polarisation of tribal identities, thus further eroding the chances of improving inter-tribal relations in the near to medium term. Finally, the prospects of ICC prosecutions may prove to be a disincentive for key figures on both sides of the conflict to find a peaceful solution, thus complicating the diplomatic work of UNAMID. Conversely, the ICC warrants may re-align the political landscape in such ways that new openings for influence or leverage over Khartoum may appear that can be seized to the advantage of the peace process.

A recent AU Panel on Darfur headed by Thabo Mbeki, the former president of South Africa, was commissioned to consult both the government and the general public to promote justice and reconciliation as well as other necessary conditions for peace.364 The panel concluded that negotiations would be
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successful only if they were preceded by justice and reconciliation efforts. Mbeki recommended a hybrid court with both AU and Sudanese judges that resembled South Africa’s Truth and Reconciliation Commission to try government officials and militia members who committed human rights violations. The AU proposal would create a system that not only held individuals who committed crimes against humanity accountable, but also engaged locals and allowed Sudanese judges to have input on any ruling. It was an alternative to the International Criminal Court. The GoS, however, claims the court would be unconstitutional because foreign judges are not permitted to sit in Sudanese courts.365

**Prospects**

UNAMID’s success or failure will depend on a number of factors, some within its control and others beyond its reach. The following issues are just the most pressing and fundamental facing UNAMID.

**External Factors**

*Peace Process*: The most significant challenge facing UNAMID is the lack of a viable political process. Unlike UNMIS, UNAMID has been mandated to help implement a peace agreement (the DPA) that has little to no relevance on the ground and efforts to bring the non-signatory parties back to the negotiating table have so far faltered. Of course, the political components of UNAMID and the AU-UN Joint Chief Mediator for Darfur, Djibrill Bassolé, have roles to play in this effort, but the reality is that the parties themselves and key external actors will be the deciding factors in any search for a lasting political settlement. Moreover, such a settlement should be comprehensive in nature and be placed within a broader, Sudan-wide context.

*Mission Deployment*: The ultimate success of a large mission like UNAMID depends, in part, on how well and how quickly the mission is able to deploy all of the components, personnel and equipment. Given the GoS track record of reluctant cooperation, if not obstructionism, in facilitating the mission’s deployment, UNAMID will have to rely on the Security Council and other sources of pressure to apply their respective influence on Khartoum to ensure a full and timely deployment.

*Required Components*: Related to the above point, UNAMID will need support from a wide range of troop contributing countries (TCCs). Given its mandate (especially its need to establish its credibility with the parties and civilians alike) and its challenging theatre of operations, UNAMID requires specialised equipment (helicopters in particular) and personnel, the kind of resources that are usually available from western militaries. Thus far, those resources either have not been offered in sufficient quantities by possible TCCs or their arrival has been contested by GoS.

*Regional Dynamics*: Much has been said in this survey about the importance of regional political, military, economic and social factors to the fate of Darfur. UNAMID will need to see progress on the political situation in Chad and, to a lesser extent, CAR if it is to achieve any long-term success in Darfur. In this regard, UNAMID must stress these regional connections to its stakeholders so that its political supporters do not lose sight of the many critical cross-border issues impacting on UNAMID’s performance. At the same time, UNAMID must build a solid working relationship with MINURCAT in Chad and CAR as cooperation with those missions will also be important to addressing mutual cross-border issues.

**Internal Factors**

*Organisation and Coordination*: Perhaps the most pressing issue facing UNAMID is translating the political necessity that is its hybrid AU-UN character into a workable, effective mission on the ground. As noted in

the 'Profile' section, this type of mission has never been tried before by the AU and UN, and certainly not on this scale. Moreover, both the AU and UN have their own, respective, organisational and support weaknesses in fielding missions, although the UN is the more experienced and better resourced of the two. UNAMID's leadership must find ways to keep two 'bosses' happy and find ways to ensure that two distinct institutional cultures do not cause problems at the working levels. Given the conflict's complexities and the number of missions and other international actors working in Sudan, the various coordination mechanisms should be robust and effective enough to encourage joint planning and decision-making as opposed to simple information sharing.

Local Ownership: As is the case for all peace operations, UNAMID cannot and should not try to impose long-term peace in Darfur. Instead, it must establish itself as a robust and credible presence in Darfur that is strong and effective enough to facilitate the emergence of the necessary political space for peace to be made and take root. This will involve adopting a posture that is firm but fair with the parties and instils confidence in all stakeholders. Specifically, however, UNAMID should engage civil society in a meaningful way and provide the political space for these groups to function and, perhaps, reclaim some of their lost authority and influence.366

Conclusion

This is just an indicative list of the more pressing and critical factors that will likely have an impact on the ultimate success or failure of UNAMID. Taken together, they suggest that the mission is facing an up-hill struggle to make a clear, positive contribution to the search for peace in Darfur. On just one issue, the need for a viable political process, the prospects are not encouraging given the GoS's apparent preference for a military solution to the conflict and the dimning hopes of reversing the rebel movement's unending fragmentation and splintering. The DPA is not a basis for peace in Darfur at this point and UNAMID cannot change that fact and, in this sense, it will be hampered much like AMIS was before it.

Yet, in the short-term, UNAMID should fare better than its predecessor insofar as UNAMID has available to it far more resources than AMIS, even if GoS continues to hinder the mission's full deployment, and a stronger mandate that allows for more forceful action when required. These elements alone should be good news for civilians in need of greater security and support. At the same time, however, with these greater resources come greater expectations on the part of the civilians (and perhaps the rebels, too). If UNAMID is timid in executing its mandate and fails early credibility tests, in the eyes of those it is trying to help, then its fate will likely be no different than that of AMIS: distrusted and ineffective record-keeper of events instead of a shaper of events.

UNMIS ISSUES - CPA Terms and Issues

There is growing concern that the CPA may be failing. As timelines for implementing the agreement continue to slip, and the parties grow increasingly suspicious of each other, the successful completion of the peace process faces major challenges. These challenges carry with them 'a real risk of renewed
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conflict down the road unless the NCP begins to implement the CPA in good faith, and the SPLM becomes a stronger and more effective implementing partner.\(^{367}\)

The most crucial issues that the parties must address, failing which the entire agreement would unravel, include the ones discussed below. Most of these issues were also among those that caused the SPLM/A to suspend its participation in the Government of National Unity (GNU) and were ultimately addressed in the 11 December 2007 agreement, which resolved the impasse.

**Inclusiveness and political support for CPA**

Although the CPA sets out a broad framework for an inclusive implementation process, many of the political players in the North, as well as some forces in the South, have been hesitant to commit themselves to an agreement they were not party to.\(^{368}\) Having been excluded from the Naivasha negotiations, most opposition parties were not committed to the provisions of the CPA regarding wealth-sharing and power-sharing between the NCP and SPLM, which they felt reflected the direct interests of only the SPLA and the Khartoum government.\(^{369}\) Northern opposition parties have criticized the CPA for allowing the NCP to dominate the GNU. In May 2009, 17 Northern opposition parties formed the National Alliance. They pledged to run one candidate against President al-Bashir in the upcoming elections. More importantly, they called for the dissolution of the GNU since it failed to hold elections by July 2009. The Alliance wants it replaced by a larger and more inclusive caretaker government.\(^{370}\)

As noted by Sudan experts recently gathered under the auspices of Chatham House, the CPA therefore cannot properly be described as as 'comprehensive' in the sense of resolving all the issues between the North and South. Despite the strict implementation timetable, deadlines and benchmarks, it still relies overwhelmingly on the goodwill and commitment of the two signatories.\(^{371}\)

The CPA makes clear that its implementation and national democratic change are interdependent. Although many northern parties have taken the opportunity provided by the CPA to join the Government of National Unity, the prevailing perception that the agreement is a two-way deal, instead of a truly comprehensive agreement, must be overcome in order for the CPA to achieve fully its objectives at the national level.\(^{372}\) Nevertheless, over time several small splinter factions from the mainstream DUP and Umma Party have joined the NCP and are now part of its 52 per cent controlling bloc in parliament.\(^{373}\) Other groupings, such as the mainstream DUP and the Communist Party, have entered parliament as part of the 14 per cent set aside for northern opposition parties. The mainstream Umma Party of Sadiq al-Mahdi and the Popular Congress have remained outside the government and are in opposition to the NCP.\(^{374}\)


\(^{370}\) Sally Healy, Sudan: Where is the Comprehensive Peace Agreement Heading, Summary record of a seminar on Sudan, Chatham House, 8 January 2008.


\(^{372}\) The Darfur Peace Agreement in May 2006 and the Eastern Sudan Peace Agreement in May 2007 resulted in the allocation of 12 new seats for parliamentarians from Darfur and eight from eastern Sudan, largely drawn from existing NCP seats. See, UNMIS CPA Monitor February 2008.

\(^{373}\) Seats were accorded as follows: 52 per cent for the ruling National Congress Party; 28 per cent for the SPLM, 14 per cent for other northern forces; and 6 per cent for other southern forces at the national level. The SPLM was granted 70 per cent of positions in the southern states and the Government of Southern Sudan. The National Congress Party was granted 70 per cent of positions in the northern states. Also see,
The lack of support for the CPA from other political parties has added more pressure on the SPLM in its relationship with the NCP. As the IGC noted, "With the many divisions that have undermined its various constituencies, the opposition is failing to serve as a credible political force or play a role in resolving impasses between the NCP and the SPLM. Moreover, the weakness of the opposition places more pressure on the SPLM as it means that the latter has little support in trying to reverse the onslaught of obstructive NCP policies. As a result, the SPLM often finds itself playing the role of opposition party, which increases the strain on its partnership with the NCP."

Meanwhile, the NCP has been engaging in an ongoing dialogue with some northern opposition parties, including the National Umma Party and the Communist Party of the Sudan, reportedly aimed at finding common ground on democratic transformation, elections and the Darfur issue.

**Redeployment of Forces**

The redeployment of Sudanese Armed Forces (SAF) and SPLA forces, as stipulated in the CPA, remains incomplete. With the SAF having missed the CPA redeployment deadline of 9 July 2007, the process is now seriously delayed. The International Crisis Group, in its report of 13 March 2008, identified three major reasons for the parties' failure to comply with redeployment provisions. First, there are questions about how well the Joint Integrated Units (JIUs) are functioning, as the SPLA and SAF contingents within many of them are not yet integrated or operating under a common leadership and military doctrine. Secondly, considerable insecurity remains in the border area, particularly around Abyei and Southern Kordofan. Finally, with North-South border demarcation still pending, there is space for both sides to argue over how far each should redeploy.

The formation of JIUs is similarly delayed and, according to UNMIS reports, for 82% of the authorized total of 39,000 personnel completed. However, the SPLA and SAF components of the JIUs remain functionally separate and under different chains of command. On 1 November 2007, the Ceasefire Political Commission directed SAF and SPLA to adhere to the present boundary between the north and the south, pending demarcation of the border of 1 January 1956. While the parties agreed to complete concurrently their respective redeployment north and south of the line by 9 January 2008, with Joint Integrated Units to be fully deployed by the same date, UNMIS reported that only 88% of some 46,000 SAF troops had been redeployed as at 15 January. Meanwhile, the NCP has conceded that some 3,600 SAF forces are remaining in the entire South but claims that these forces are required to protect the oilfields pending full deployment of the JIUs. The NCP further claims that the SPLA has failed to redeploy most of its forces south of the 1956 line. UNMIS has confirmed that, as of 15 January, SPLA troop redeployment remains at only 8.5 per cent of the stated strength of some
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377 The SPLA also claims the SAF is contributing ex-militia, not regular forces, to the units. See, *International Crisis Group, Sudan’s Comprehensive Peace Agreement: Beyond the Crisis, Africa Briefing No. 50*, 13 March 2008.


379 The SPLA also claims the SAF is contributing ex-militia, not regular forces, to the units. See, *International Crisis Group, Sudan’s Comprehensive Peace Agreement: Beyond the Crisis, Africa Briefing No. 50*, 13 March 2008.
59,000. SPLA-aligned forces in the North also began redeployment towards southern Sudan. However, as of 15 January, they had not deployed to agreed assembly areas but had stopped in contested areas around the disputed line of 1 January 1956, where their continued presence has become a source of additional tension.

Abyei

The resolution of the Abyei question, a contentious issue during the CPA negotiations, has so far remained elusive. Under the CPA, Abyei was granted a special administrative status, with the right of a referendum on whether to remain part of the North or join a potentially independent South. The NCP and SPLM also agreed to establish the Abyei Boundaries Commission (ABC) to determine the geographic boundaries defined in the Abyei Protocol. The international experts on the commission decided the borders after GoS and SPLM delegations failed to agree. When the report was presented to the presidency on 14 July 2005, the SPLM endorsed the findings and the NCP rejected them, claiming the experts had exceeded their mandate. The Misseriya population in Abyei opposes the implementation of the ABC report amid fears that their historic tribal passage and grazing rights could be lost. Because of this deadlock, Abyei’s status remains undetermined, and no formal administrative structures have been put into place. As part of the agreement of 11 December 2007, which resolved the latest political stalemate between the NCP and SPLM, the presidency agreed to create a mechanism for implementation of the Abyei Protocol.

The appointment by the SPLM of a senior party official as administrator of the area, following the December agreement, served to increase tensions and led to serious clashes between members of the Ngok Dinka and Misseriya tribes in Abyei, with the Misseriya accusing the NCP of acquiescence. They temporarily blocked the North-South roads through Abyei and a Misseriya movement called the Abyei Liberation Movement in February announced a new state, with Abyei as its capital.

In May 2008, a local dispute escalated into full-blowd fighting between SAF and SPLA forces killing at least 90, forcing 50,000 to flee and burning much of Abyei town to the ground. Tensions subsided after a committee of senior officials from both sides set out a “road map” to defuse the conflict. As part of the agreement, a Joint Integrated Unit (JIU) (320 SPLA soldiers, 319 SAF soldiers) deployed to Abyei to take control of the town. Leaders from both sides also agreed that a commission from the Hague-based Permanent Court of Arbitration would decide the borders of the disputed region.

In the wake of this incident, UNMIS was heavily criticized for its failure to protect the civilian population. US special envoy Richard Williamson told the Security Council that UN peacekeepers had holed up in their barracks while Abyei was attacked. He argued that UNMIS could do more and that it should interpret its mandate more robustly than it has done so far if it is to contribute to stability and to protect civilians. UN special envoy Ashraf Qazi rejected the criticism and said in a statement: ‘Whenever - despite our peace keeping efforts - large-scale hostilities break out between the two parties, UNMIS has neither the capacity nor the mandate to militarily intervene or to provide law enforcement functions.’ In reaction to this debate, the Security Council asked the UN on June 24 to investigate the actions of UNMIS during recent deadly clashes and consider what follow-up steps might be appropriate.

As noted by the ICG, the Abyei situation poses a serious challenge to the NCP-SPLM partnership, as the Misseriya accuses the NCP of cutting a deal with the SPLM and wanting 'the Misseriya to fight the war for it.'
so it can keep its hands clean.’ The motivating factor behind such strategy in Abyei would be the vast oil reserves that exist in the Abyei area.387

In July 2009, the Permanent Court of Arbitration issued a ruling on the permanent boundaries of the Abyei area. Both the NCP and SPLM agreed to abide by the decision, which offers both parties some benefits. The court ruling preserved the bulk of the region defined by the CPA in 2005. However, it did grant the North the Hegling and Bamboo oilfields. The South gained additional land and kept the Diffra field. The court also ruled that Abyei belongs to the nine Ngok-Dinka Chiefdoms. In December 2009, both the National Assembly and The Southern Assembly endorsed the Abyei referendum for January 2011. Residents of the Abyei area will vote whether to stay with the North or break with the South if it chooses to secede from Sudan. Even though the NCP and the SPLM backed the referendum, it is not without controversy. Parliamentarians from the Messeriya tribe, who migrate in and out of Abyei walked out of the assembly because the bill did not mention them by name. They fear that they will lose the right to vote on the region’s future.388

North-South Border Demarcation

Although demarcation of the border was supposed to be carried out during the pre-interim period of the CPA, which ended in July 2005, the Technical Ad Hoc Border Committee, tasked by the CPA with the demarcation process, undertook its first reconnaissance survey only in early 2007.

The delay is reportedly due to lack of sufficient ongoing funding of the committee. The SPLM has blamed the NCP for ‘blocking’ the committee’s funds, which come from the Oil Stabilization Fund. In the December 2007 agreement that settled the political stalemate between the NCP and SPLM, the presidency has pledged to allocate funds for border demarcation as well as for preparations for the census and elections. The Technical Ad Hoc Border Committee reportedly finalized the process of classifying maps and documents in December 2007 and would soon thereafter begin delineating the border on maps. The Committee is now expected to present its report to the presidency (which would need to approve the recommendations before actual demarcation can begin) in the first quarter of 2008.389

Since they will have far-reaching impact on wealth and power sharing, the committee’s determinations are expected to be hotly contested, nationally and locally. The lack of demarcation impacts on nearly every other issue, including the national unity government’s capacity to calculate a fair share of oil revenues, since the majority of oilfields lie along the border. The findings of the committee will also determine which parts of Sudan will be able to take part in the 2011 referendum.390

Given the start of the rainy season and general insecurity around the military redeployment zones and Abyei, it is unclear if the demarcation will be completed in time for the census, rescheduled for the second half of April.

387 See, International Crisis Group, Sudan’s Comprehensive Peace Agreement; Beyond the Crisis, Africa Briefing No. 50, 13 March 2008, and see also, Roger Winter and John Prendergast, _Abyei: Sudan’s Kashmir_ , Sudan Tribune, 18 February 2008.
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National Census and Elections

The CPA provides for a nationwide census that should have been conducted by the end of the second year of the interim period (July 2007). The census "would provide baseline information, which could be used for development and services across the country and determine electoral constituencies and the appropriate representation of North and South at the national level (with power-sharing percentages 'either confirmed or adjusted on the basis of the census results'), as well as verify voter registration figures. For these reasons, the census, and how it is conducted, is both a highly charged issue and a prerequisite for elections."\(^{391}\)

Progress in planning for the national census has been hampered by several factors. While a pilot census was completed in April 2007, the national population census was delayed due to concerns about the preparedness of the Southern Census Commission, linked to the slow disbursement of funds by the national government. This severely delayed mapping of the southern areas. However, as part of the 11 December 2007 agreement between the NCP and SPLM, the NCP agreed to release the funds. This has reportedly been done and UNMIS could report that by the end of December 2007, field mapping was 94 per cent complete in the north, roughly 87 per cent complete in the south, and more than 60 per cent complete in Darfur.\(^{392}\)

Even with funding resolved, a successful census still depends on many issues. These include border demarcation, the security problems in Southern Kordofan, Unity and Jonglei states,\(^{393}\) training of the census-takers and a solution to logistical problems, such as lack of roads in many areas, distribution of materials and the start of the rainy season.\(^{394}\) Even more problematic is the way in which 'technical' census decisions appear to be increasingly politicised, in an apparent bid by both the southern and northern census commissions to make things more difficult for each other.\(^{395}\) On 31 January 2008, the Secretary-General reported to the Security Council that "the implications of the situation for the future electoral process and, in particular, its impact on the determination of constituencies, is becoming a matter of increasing concern."\(^{396}\)

Owing to severe delays in the planning for the nationwide census, primarily caused by funding delays by the Government of National Unity, the census had to be postponed several times and has been rescheduled for the second half of April 2008. On 11 April, First Vice-President Salva Kiir urged all Sudanese to participate in the census.\(^{397}\) On 12 April, however, the SPLM announced that it had suspended the census until the north-south border is demarcated, all southerners living in the North return to the South and questions concerning religion and ethnicity be included in the census.\(^{398}\) The NCP denounced the move and following crisis talks between President Bashir and GoSS President Salva Kiir,
the row was resolved and the presidency announced that the census would start all over the country on 22 April 2008.\(^{399}\)

Census results were finally released on 21 May 2009. The SPLM, the State Government of South Kordofan, and JEM immediately rejected the results claiming that they were rigged in favour of the NCP. In Darfur, fears of government manipulation led some IDP camps to boycott the census. The proportion of seats given to the South by the census was rejected by the Southern Assembly the day before the National Election Commission released its report on representation in the National Assembly. When the report was released the South was granted 20% of the total seats, down from the 34% granted by the 1986 census. As a result, the Joint High Executive Political Committee has been unable to finalize the census results.

Election planning is now also severely behind the CPA schedule. Elections that were mandated by the CPA to take place in July 2009 were first postponed until February 2010 and then until April 2010. Voter registration finally took place between November 1 and December 7; however, it has already been contested by opposition groups across Sudan.\(^{400}\) Though the registration process itself was peaceful, the Carter Center reported that the percentage of voters registered was uneven across the country. The government extended registration by a week to solve this problem, but it was poorly publicized and had limited success.\(^{401}\) When voicing their opposition to the registration process, the SPLM and other opposition groups point to irregularities that benefit the NCP. Certain voting centres were not open the entire month and efforts to register the Sudanese Diaspora were prohibited in bordering nations with large numbers of Southern refugees. In Darfur, a three month residency law required IDPs to return home by August if they wish to vote in their native constituencies. Any individual who left the camp after that would be prohibited from voting. If these irregularities are not addressed, many opposition groups will boycott the election.\(^{402}\)

**Transparency in the Oil Sector**

The Protocol on Wealth Sharing of the CPA sets out principles for the management and development of the oil industry and for the sharing of oil revenues, under the authority of the National Petroleum Commission, which was established in October 2005. The NPC, which is co-chaired by GNU President al-Bashir and Government of South Sudan (GoSS) President Salva Kiir, did not meet until April 2007, when the NCP and SPLM agreed on rules of procedures for the Commission and on the mechanism of negotiating new oil contracts.

Pursuant to the CPA, half of the oil revenues from the South, which is responsible for about 85% of the national output, are to be transferred to the GoSS. Revenues from oil produced in the North accrue exclusively to the Government of National Unity. Transfers of oil revenue to the Southern Sudan and States levels have taken place since 2005, although GNU and GoSS disagree over boundaries in the oil producing areas, as well as over the figures of oil production. Institutional delays related to the establishment of the NPC continued to impede timely transfers of funds to delegated levels of government. Delay in demarcation of the 1956 border, and a lack of transparency in calculating oil
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revenues continued in 2007 to fuel mistrust over the division of oil revenues, adding to the grievances that led the SPLM to suspend its participation in the Government of National Unity in October 2007. As one commentator observed, oil was not the main issue causing the North-South conflict, for the conflict preceded the discovery of oil in the South. However, it has become an element in the centre of the conflict also because of its potential for rectifying the problems that had occupied the centre of the Sudanese conflict for too long: absence of social, economic, and infrastructural development in the South.

Following the political stand-off between the NCP and SPLM in late 2007, the NCP recommitted in the December 2007 agreement with the SPLM, to 'full and transparent' management in the oil sector, as well as to re-launching the National Petroleum Commission. The SPLM, while a member of that body, had felt there was little transparency in the revenue figures it was receiving from the NCP. Because it was blocked from the production and marketing of the oil, it had no way of knowing how much was really sold and at what price. The December agreement also granted the GoSS a role in the day-to-day management of oil processes, terminals and marketing. Once in effect, the changes should allow the GoSS to confirm production figures, pumping and export numbers and revenue calculations. However, as of yet, the SPLM has not yet been given access to existing exploitation contracts, and the National Petroleum Commission has not met since mid-2007. Furthermore, the NCP and SPLM have not yet been able to settle their dispute over the status and rights to conclude pre-CPA oil contracts, which pursuant to the CPA, would stand and not be subject to review by the National Petroleum Commission.

Meanwhile, figures released by the Ministry of Finance and National Economy show that total oil revenue for October 2007 amounted to more than $530 million. This was the highest figure since the beginning of petroleum production in the country. According to the same source, the share of the Government of Southern Sudan amounted to more than $208 million.

**Security Issues**

**The Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA)**

The LRA is one of the most notorious rebel armies in the world. Under the command of Joseph Kony and his second-in-command Vincent Otti, the group has been an armed opponent of the Government of Uganda and President Yoweri Museveni since 1987, and the Government of Uganda has responded with structural violence on a grand scale against the people of northern Uganda.

The LRA promotes a radical form of Christianity which it wants to make the foundation of a new Ugandan government. But beyond that stated aim, and its purported commitment to ‘establishing a government based on the biblical Ten Commandments’ the LRA appears to have no clear political agenda. Based in northern Uganda, southern Sudan and, more recently, the DRC, the current strength of the LRA is
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approximately 3,000, of whom approximately 80% are youth and children, who are kidnapped and brainwashed into service with the group, including girls who serve as sex slaves. The LRA seeks to achieve its objectives primarily through unbridled brutality, including rape, torture, and murder, mainly visited upon civilians.

The arrival of the Lord’s Resistance Army (LRA) in Sudan in 1993-94 (eventually followed by elements of Uganda’s Army, the Uganda Peoples Defence Force (UPDF), marked the beginning of more than 15 years of fighting involving Ugandans on Sudanese soil. The LRA had ventured into Sudan to seek refuge from the fighting in Uganda, but the Sudanese government turned the LRA into a significant actor in Khartoum’s efforts to crush the southern rebellion. A partnership between Khartoum and the LRA was established that would benefit both: ‘Khartoum ran a proxy war through the LRA against both the SPLA and the UPDF, while the LRA obtained supplies and assistance in its attempt to overthrow Museveni. Moving into the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) in 2005, the LRA became a genuine threat to regional security.’

In 2002, the Sudanese government reversed its longstanding policy of support and began cooperating in international efforts to eliminate the group’s sanctuaries. Early attempts at mediation with the LRA all failed, but the negotiation process gained renewed attention in November 2006, when Jan Egeland, then UN Undersecretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, traveled to LRA camps along the Sudan-Uganda border. By that time, the LRA had been underground without communicating with the outside world for many years, and the International Criminal Court (ICC) had issued arrest warrants in July 2005 against Joseph Kony and several of his lieutenants. The mediation with Egeland particularly interested Kony as he sought to gain an ally in his case with the ICC. It also served to open lines of communication for subsequent negotiations.

In late 2005 the newly established GoSS, in which the SPLM holds the majority, changed its approach to the LRA. After Otti announced on the radio in the autumn of 2005 that the LRA wanted peace, the GoSS attempted to establish contact. Peace delegates of the LRA had already made the link with Nairobi-based Acholi elders who consulted with local Sudanese politicians and consequently linked them to Machar. Machar, who had become vice-president of the GoSS after the death of John Garang, offered to negotiate. In February 2006, a viable contact was established. The first meeting between Otti and Machar took place in April 2006 and eventually led to the first meeting with Kony the following month. The Juba Peace Talks officially began on 14 July 2006 in the Southern Sudanese capital of Juba, and were mediated by South Sudanese Vice-President Riek Machar and the UN Special Envoy Joaquim Chissano. Between July 2007 and February 2008, the two sides signed at least three important agreements on accountability, on the prosecution of war crimes, and on DDR. However, recent attempts to obtain Kony’s signature on a final agreement have stalled.
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415 The accord is also a significant development in the evolving debate over the role of the International Criminal Court in Uganda: the Court has issued arrest warrants against the leaders of the LRA, and the LRA has said that any peace agreement is conditional on an agreement from the Ugandan government that rebel leaders will not face trial before an international court. The newly-concluded war crimes agreement takes the form of an annex to an earlier accord between Uganda and the LRA setting out a general framework for accountability and reconciliation. Under the agreement, the government will set up a special division of the High Court of Uganda to try “individuals who are alleged to have committed serious crimes during the conflict. At the same time, alongside the special war crimes division of the High Court, the agreement also gives a prominent place to traditional justice. It says that the government Òshall, in
agreement have been unsuccessful, including a scheduled meeting as recent as 10 April 2008. The LRA continues to be a source of instability and violence in the South. Since December 2008, LRA attacks have killed 200 civilians and displaced 68,000.

Other Armed Groups

The CPA brought a formal end to the state of hostilities between the GoS and the SPLM/A, but it did not end the many ongoing internal conflicts in South Sudan. The CPA recognised only the SPLM/A, leaving out smaller groups in the South, and the potential for in-fighting among southerners was not addressed, despite a well-known rivalry between two main ethnic groups, the Dinka and Nuer. The CPA therefore ignored the grievances of up to 30 other armed groups around Sudan, who had similar demands for a share of power and resources. Ignoring these groups in the peace negotiations is partly to blame for the uprising in Darfur. The main armed group left out of the CPA was the South Sudan Defence Forces (SSDF), a predominantly Nuer group previously supported by Khartoum in exchange for protecting the oilfields against the SPLA.

Under the stipulations of the CPA, the SSDF was supposed to be subsumed within the SPLA or SAF by January 2006, as the CPA mandated that there could be no ‘third army’ in South Sudan after this deadline. Yet the exact mechanisms for ensuring this were left decidedly ambiguous in the text. The SPLM/A undertook a south-south dialogue with the formerly pro-GoS militias, which culminated in the signing, on 8 January 2006, of an agreement between the President of South Sudan, Salva Kiir, and Paulino Matip of the SSDF, entitled the Juba Declaration. Although the majority of SSDF forces thereafter aligned themselves with the SPLM/A, a few groups have remained either supported by Khartoum or have not declared their allegiance, and continue to maintain a reduced armed presence in South Sudan, in contradiction to the dictates of the CPA and leaving open possibilities for continued disruption to the peace process.

Regional Dynamics

The GoS’s aggressive attempts to export political Islam in the region, together with the stalled IGAD peace process, served to galvanize the countries of the Horn, and in particular Eritrea, Ethiopia and Uganda, to launch military operations against Khartoum. And while the initiative clearly came from the region, the USA provided military assistance to these three countries and hoped that it would produce, together with the actions of the SPLM/A and the northern armed opposition, sufficient momentum to overthrow the 

collection with relevant interlocutors, examine the practice of traditional justice mechanisms in affected areas, with a view to identifying the most appropriate roles for such mechanisms. The accord does not contain any explicit statement regarding the government’s policy on the ICC arrest warrants, but there are a number of signs that the Ugandan government intends to argue that an international prosecution is no longer necessary or appropriate. Ultimately, if a credible war crimes court is established in Uganda, the ICC may decide to declare the case inadmissible. If the ICC does not defer to the Ugandan war crimes system by declaring the cases inadmissible, then Uganda will be obliged to hand the suspects over for trial in The Hague. A ready agreement between the LRA and Uganda shows that the interplay between international justice and peace negotiations can be more complex than is sometimes recognised. See Anthony Dworkin, ‘The Uganda-LRA War Crimes Agreement and the International Criminal Court,’ Global Policy Forum, Crimes of War Project, 25 February 2008.
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regime in Khartoum. On the political front the attempted assassination of Mubarak led Egypt to join Ethiopia in co-sponsoring a Security Council resolution with strong US support for an embargo against Sudan.

Khartoum's 'Islamist onslaught' ended by the late 1990s, but the reactive politics of the past fifty years in the Horn are too deeply entrenched to imagine they can be easily overcome. Sudan thus entered the post-conflict stage of the North-South peace process with unstable relations with most of its neighbours, and stability in Sudan and the well-being of the peace process depend crucially on improving those relations.

Prospects

As the UNMIS mandate is closely related to the implementation of the CPA, the mission's success will to a great extent be determined by the commitment of the NCP and SPLM/A to implement the Agreement, in accordance with agreed timelines.

Most critical timelines in the CPA, including those for the establishment of key institutions, the redeployment of forces, border demarcations and the preparation of the national census and elections, have already been missed due to the lack of political will and capacity. These delays add to the prevailing mistrust between the parties and contribute to conditions on the ground that could lead to renewed violence, especially in the three areas of Abyei, Southern Kordofan and Blue Nile States, and the unravelling of the agreement as a whole.

The role of UNMIS role in averting this outcome lies in the strong support of the full and timely implementation of the CPA, including by providing good offices and mediation to resolve outstanding issues. As ICG notes, with the establishment of the separate United Nations African Union Mission in Darfur (UNAMID) UNMIS should be able to refocus its activities on the core mandate of supporting CPA implementation.

The crucial responsibility of UNMIS to monitor and verify the redeployment of forces and formation of joint integrated units is complicated by the restrictions on its freedom of movement imposed by the parties, in particular in the flashpoint area of Abyei.

As requested by the Security Council, the Secretary-General is presently undertaking a strategic assessment of the mission's mandate and configuration to enhance its ability to support the CPA implementation. Preliminary findings indicate the need for a review of the mission's military strength and clarification of the mission's mandate with regard to census and elections as well as border demarcation. The Secretary-General's specific recommendations for possible mandate changes are expected to be presented in April 2008.423

Due to the formal link between the UNMIS mandate and the CPA, further delays in its implementation would affect the mission's exit strategy, as a possible extension of the transition period beyond 2011 could have obvious repercussions for the length of the mission, subject to the parties' agreement. As the ICG notes, the SPLM and NCP calculate that they still have much to gain through continued partnership, by
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advancing their strategies within the CPA framework. 'As the dates for national elections and the southern referendum come near, however, these calculations may change and again put the CPA, with its promise of the country’s democratic transformation, in danger.'

As the fate of the CPA is uncertain, so is the future of UNMIS. Serious questions loom for the future of the mission in the event that the parties suspend implementation of the CPA, or their cooperation with UNMIS. UNMIS, with its current mandate and its current strength and configuration, will not be in a position to prevent a return to armed conflict by the parties.[58]
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