Security Sector Reform in Africa: The Promise and the Practice of a New Donor Approach

Daniel Bendix and Ruth Stanley

Occasional Paper Series: Volume 3, Number 2, 2008

ACCORD
THE AFRICAN CENTRE FOR THE CONSTRUCTIVE RESOLUTION OF DISPUTES

The *Occasional Paper Series* is published by the African Centre for the Constructive Resolution of Disputes (ACCORD). ACCORD is a non-governmental, non-aligned conflict resolution organisation based in Durban, South Africa. ACCORD is constituted as an educational trust.

ISSN 1608-3954

Contents

Abbreviations

ACPP	Africa Conflict Prevention Pool (UK)
AFL	Armed Forces of Liberia
AFRICOM	United States Africa Command
ASDR	African Security Dialogue & Research
ASSN	African Security Sector Network
AU	African Union
BCPR	Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery (UNDP)
BICC	Bonn International Centre for Conversion
BINUB	United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi
BMZ	Bundesministerium fuer Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (Germany)
CDD	Centre for Democracy and Development
CCSSP	Commonwealth Community Safety and Security Project
CIDA	Canadian International Development Agency
CIVPOL	UN Civilian Police
CODESRIA	Council for the Development of Social Science Research in Africa
CPA	Comprehensive Peace Agreement
CPP	Conflict Prevention Pool (UK)
DAC	Development Assistance Committee (OECD)
Danida	Danish International Development Assistance (Denmark)
DAT	Defence Advisory Team
DCAF	Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces
DDR	Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration
DFAIT	Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (Canada)

DFID	Department for International Development (UK)
DIIS	Danish Institute for International Studies (Denmark)
DoD	Department of Defence
DoJ	Department of Justice (US)
DRC	Democratic Republic of the Congo
DSF	Deutsche Stiftung Friedensforschung (German Foundation for Peace Research)
EAC	East African Community
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ESDP	European Security and Defence Policy
EU	European Union
EUCOM	United States European Command
EUPOL	EU Police Mission in Kinshasa (DRC)
EUSEC	EU Security Sector Reform Mission in the DRC
FCO	Foreign and Commonwealth Office (UK)
GCPP	Global Conflict Prevention Pool (UK)
GFN	Global Facilitation Network for Security Sector Reform (UK)
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft fuer Technische Zusammenarbeit (Germany)
IANSA	International Action Network on Small Arms
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (World Bank)
ICG	International Crisis Group
ICITAP	International Criminal Investigative Training Assistance Programme
IMATT	International Military and Training Team (UK)
IMET	International Military Education and Training (US)
IMF	International Monetary Fund

INSTRAW	United Nations International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women
ISS	Institute for Security Studies
JSDP	Justice Sector Development Programme
JSRP	Justice Sector Reform Programme
JSSR	Justice and Security Sector Reform (UNDP)
KAIPTC	Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre
LNP	Liberia National Police
MALPOD	Malawi Police Organizational Development
MaSSAJ	Malawi Safety, Security and Access to Justice Programme
MDRP	Multi-Country Demobilisation and Reintegration Programme
MoD	Ministry of Defence
MONUC	Mission de l'ONU en RD Congo
n.d.	no data / no date
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NPFL	National Patriotic Front of Liberia
ODA	Official Development Assistance
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
ONS	Office of National Security (Sierra Leone)
PAE	Pacific Architects and Engineers
PRIO	International Peace Research Institute (Norway)
PSC	Private Security Company
PSO	Peace Support Operations
PSTC	Peace Support Training Centre
RAND	Research And Development
REJUSCO	Restauration de la Justice à l'Est de la RDC
SADC	Southern Africa Development Community

SADSEM	Southern Africa Defence and Security Management Network
SALW	Small Arms and Light Weapons
SILSEP	Sierra Leone Security Sector Reform Programme
SSAJ	Security, Safety and Accessible Justice Programme
SSDAT	Security Sector Development and Advisory Team
SSR	Security Sector Reform
SSS	Special Security Services
UN	United Nations
UNAMSIL	UN Mission in Sierra Leone
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNHCR	UN High Commissioner for Refugees
UNIOSIL	UN Integrated Office for Sierra Leone
UNMIL	United Nations Mission in Liberia
UNMIS	United Nations Mission in Sudan
UNOCI	United Nations Operation in Côte d'Ivoire
UNOG	United Nations Office at Geneva
UK	United Kingdom
US	United States (of America)
USA	United States of America
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

Abstract

When the concept of security sector reform (SSR) was introduced some 10 years ago, it aimed to offer an innovative approach to the reform of security governance. Within the SSR paradigm, such reform was seen as an essential precondition of sustainable development and was envisaged as encompassing the entire spectrum of security institutions, including the military, police, intelligence services and the penal system. Besides this holistic approach and the link with development, the novelty of the concept resided in the emphasis on local ownership of the reform process; on principles of legality, accountability, and transparency; and on its embrace of a wide understanding of security, encompassing territorial integrity, state security, and individual security. A review of SSR projects in Africa with significant input from external donors reveals considerable variations of approach, while a comparative analysis of SSR in Sierra Leone and Liberia contrasts the differing application of core principles of SSR in these two cases. The paper concludes that there is no consistent approach to SSR, and that in practice, the concept fails to live up to its innovative potential. For this potential to become reality, the SSR dialogue needs to take voices and experiences from the global South into account, rather than merely reflect a donor perspective.

About the authors

Daniel Bendix is conducting research on security sector reform in a project funded by the German Foundation for Peace Research (DSF). He is a doctoral candidate at the University of Manchester's Institute for Development Policy and Management.

Ruth Stanley teaches international and comparative politics at the Free University of Berlin. She is currently directing a research project on security sector reform funded by the DSF.

Introduction

The concept of security sector reform (SSR) has only been in currency for some 10 years. However, it has already come to occupy a central place on the agenda of institutions active in the fields of development, conflict transformation and peacebuilding. Broadly speaking, the security sector is usually understood to encompass all the organisations that have the authority to use, or order the use of, force in order to protect communities, individuals, and the state.[1] These include the military, police, border guards, intelligence services, government bodies that monitor such organisations, and those institutions charged with upholding the rule of law, including the judiciary and the penal system. It is also recognised that civil society organisations, international donors and the media can have an important role in SSR processes, and that non-state actors such as private security and military companies and non-state armed groups need to be included within SSR.

Development donors had been dealing with security-related issues in an *ad hoc* manner since the early 1990s, but it was not until the end of that decade that the term "security sector reform" became prominent, notably through policy statements issued by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID).[2] Brzoska points out that the concept of SSR responds to a situation characterised by new opportunities provided by the lifting of earlier political constraints on security-related development assistance in the context of the Cold War, as well as to the new challenges posed by demands for an effective development donor role in conflict prevention, post-conflict reconstruction, and anti-terrorism. The term SSR seeks to link these challenges and opportunities and at the same time to imbue them with a common vision, that of "a security sector which promotes human development, helps to reduce poverty, and allows people – including poor people – to expand their options in life".[3] There are a number of rationales for conceptualising the reform of the security sector as an essential element in the fight against poverty. First, the role of the state and its security forces directly impact on opportunities for sustainable development, since basic security is a precondition of economic development. Second, reducing expenditure on security forces frees resources for social investment and poverty reduction. Third, the security sector, especially the police and the military, often contributes to violent conflict rather than containing or

preventing it, and violent conflict is recognised as one of the major causes of poverty. Finally, greater participation in security policy and access to security is expected to make policies more responsive to the concerns of the poor, as well as strengthening democracy by guaranteeing transparency and accountability in this most sensitive (and closed) area of policy.[4]

Conceptualising security sector reform in this way, as a means towards poverty reduction, human development, and expanding life options for all people, implies certain principles that are made explicit in major policy formulations:

- SSR adopts an holistic approach, recognising that effective reform of security institutions needs to encompass the different components of the security sector in an integrated fashion. One of the novel aspects of SSR is that it is precisely not about piecemeal tinkering, but aims to achieve a broad reform of all dimensions of security provision, both with regard to (external) national defence and (internal) public security.

- Reform of the security sector is intended not simply to enhance the efficiency of the security forces, but to ensure that they conform to standards of legality, transparency and accountability. Indeed, SSR is seen as an important element of democratisation, and in this sense, guidelines call for the process to be led by local actors and merely supported by external donors; hence, local ownership is seen as essential to the success of SSR.[5]

- SSR is concerned to have a positive impact not only on the security of the state (or that of the government of the day), but also on the security of communities and individuals, guaranteeing security provisions that are respectful of human rights and within the rule of law. The recognition given to individual security, in turn, implies a sensitivity to the differing security concerns of various segments of society and categories of people, as well as to the human rights impact of security policies.

In principle, all major Western donor countries have subscribed to this new concept. The Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) has produced major handbooks on SSR that are generally considered "state of the art" and essential reference material.[6] After some ten years of experience with SSR, it seems

appropriate to review donor practice and to ask how far this innovative concept has, in fact, changed donor policy on the ground. What evidence do we have of a truly holistic aproach to reform of security structures? How does the commitment to principles such as legality, transparency and accountability actually play out in development aid? If individual security is at least as important as state security: what policies are adopted to guarantee such security? Are those affected by such policies consulted, and do they have a significant input into the design and implementation of SSR projects? This paper addresses these questions by looking at the practice of Western donors involved in SSR projects in Africa. We first briefly set out the arguments for comprehensive, people-centred security reforms in Africa, before turning to donor practice. In this section, we ask how far the commitment to a comprehensive strategy is reflected in institutional arrangements in donor countries, and then proceed to present a general overview of the approach to SSR in Africa adopted by significant external actors. In the following section, we then examine two high-profile cases of SSR with very significant external input – Sierra Leone and Liberia. In both countries, sweeping reforms of the security sector have been or are being carried out; in both, the heavy dependence on external donors provides the latter with an opportunity to support and encourage comprehensive security sector reconstruction reflecting the core principles of SSR discussed above. Thus, they can both be seen as test cases that enable us to examine how far the practice of external actors does in fact conform to these principles. We close by summarizing our findings and suggesting how the practice of SSR could be enhanced.

Why SSR in Africa?

In many ways, the case for SSR in a majority of African countries seems compelling, and many have undertaken their own comprehensive reform effforts with little or no input from development donors. This is the case, for example, with South Africa's experience in reforming its security architecture, a process which received considerable external funding but was conceived and executed by South Africans. Although generalisations across the continent obviously risk over-simplyfing a complex topic, scholars are broadly agreed on a number of recurring features that give special salience to the inclusive and normative approach inherent in the concept of SSR.

A first obvious argument is the continuing pervasiveness of violent conflict and other threats to security. Compared with the decades immediately following liberation from colonial rule, the 1990s witnessed an increase in violent conflict, which on one estimate has cost the continent at least US $ 18 billion per year, in monetary terms, since the end of the Cold War.[7] To the immediate human cost of violent conflict is thus added the loss of future opportunities that is a concommitant of squandering of resources on armed conflict. More generally, public safety is low in many countries and internal stability remains a problem.[8] High crime rates and the proliferation of small arms contribute to high levels of physical insecurity in many African countries.[9]

Many African scholars relate current security problems to the specific nature of the African state and its institutions as legacies of colonialism. The colonial state never achieved the same depth of societal penetration and support as the European state, nor did it ever aspire to do so, serving simply to further the economic and political interests of the colonisers.[10] As an instrument of foreign domination whose borders were arbitrarily imposed by colonial fiat, it remained simultaneously distant and oppressive. The particular historical genesis of the state in Africa helps to account for a number of specific features that still colour the provision of security. Thus, Rocklyn Williams has asserted that

> "[v]irtually all African security institutions, in general, and armed forces, in particular, are near mirror reflections of their former colonial security institutions. The rank structure is the same with very few exceptions […], the doctrine has admitted to few indigenous revisions […], their institutional culture aping that of either the British, the French or the American value system and the ideological themes that pervade their discourse are manifestly European in origin".[11]

While in some African countries, independence brought policies aimed at inclusiveness, in others, the ruling political elites replicated the instrumental approach of their colonial predecessors to state power, and security forces continued to serve the interests of the ruling elites rather than the security requirements of the people.[12] Foreign in inspiration and lacking a tradition of serving the needs of the people, the security institutions are often an object of fear and distrust; the view is widespread "that the security sector is incapable, useless and ultimately only serves the rich".[13]

Moreover, a monopoly on the legitimate use of violence was never achieved by the colonial state – nor was this indeed necessary for the purposes of extraction and military and political control. Security regimes in various African countries have therefore been characterised by an array of non-state as well as state armed actors, including private security/military companies, local militias, guerrilla armies, warlords, vigilantes, community self-policing groups and others, with the state representing just one among many providers of security in many fragile and post-conflict states.[14] In such a context, individuals may prefer non-state security providers because they are seen as more accessible, fair, affordable, effective and understandable (using the local language and culturally appropriate methods).[15] Thus, non-state armed actors may appear to offer better security to specific groups or individuals than can be expected from state security forces, although this frequently entails the provision of security as a club good available only to a certain clientele, while increasing insecurity for others. Of course, this could also be true of state security forces.

All the above would seem to make SSR an appropriate concept for African states aiming to reform their security sectors in such a way as to enhance democratic control, strengthen the security of the poor, reduce the risk of violent conflict and free resources for social change. In some countries, there is an obvious window of opportunity for such far-reaching reform. In contexts of post-conflict peacebuilding, the question of dealing with armed actors, both state and non-state — as well as the wider question of strengthening institutions that guarantee broad participation and inclusiveness — is always of primary concern. But in cases of non-violent regime change, too, the future configuration and role of the security sector in the context of democratisation is a central issue, not least because, in many cases, the military and other security institutions were the mainstay of the previous authoritarian regime.[16] While political democratisation undoubtedly opens up space for comprehensive reform of the security sector, it by no means guarantees such reform.[17] However, if transitions to democracy are propitious for SSR, reform is also being undertaken for other reasons: dependence on external aid provides foreign donors with an opportunity to push for security reforms; and security policy forms an integral part of the proposals states commit to in the context of Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers. Thus, one of the reasons for the prevalence of SSR is donor insistence on fiscal reform

and public expenditure management, with the security sector being viewed in this context as simply another sphere of government activity to which the same general principles of fiscal rectitude apply.[18]

However, if SSR is sometimes imposed by Western donors, it also resonates strongly with African concerns. The emphasis on the security of individuals and communities, as well as the security of states, that constitutes one of the features differentiating SSR from earlier forms of military and police assistance, touches a chord in Africa. Long before the concept of human security became common currency, a people-centred aproach to security was being advocated in some African states that sought to distance themselves from the former colonial powers as well as from the bipolar confrontation of the Cold War era.[19] Cheryl Hendricks has argued that the need to broaden core conceptualisations of security has also been a central part of the more recent African dialogue on security, and indeed, that the entry of human security into the international discourse emerged as a response to structural conditions on the continent[20]. Although this shift towards the security and safety of individuals and communities has not displaced notions of state and territorial security,[21] it has opened a space for new thinking on security issues that emphasises participation, accountability and transparency as much as it does technical and professional expertise. This shift towards the individual as the referent object of security is echoed in the emphasis on community and individual security to be found in conceptual writings on SSR.

SSR and external actors

Coordinating mechanisms in donor countries

Security sector reform calls for a comprehensive approach to reform encompassing all the institutions of the security sector as well as actors from civil society, oversight bodies, and others. Therefore, its implementation seems to require not only close cooperation between such institutions in the recipient country, but also between those bodies and government ministries in the donor country that have a role to play in these programmes. Thus, a first useful indicator of commitment to the holistic SSR paradigm is the extent to which

coordination structures have been established to ensure such cooperation. In this regard, the UK has created new institutions charged with formulating a coordinated approach to SSR. Special programmes were set up with input from the Department for International Development, the Ministry of Defence (MoD), and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) to coordinate policy: the Global Conflict Prevention Pool (GCPP) and the Africa Conflict Prevention Pool (ACPP). The ACPP focused on issues relating to conflict and development on this continent, with SSR being the primary approach towards conflict prevention in Africa and taking up the largest part of ACPP programme expenditure.[22] The ACPP was particularly active in Sierra Leone, Uganda, Ghana and in several Southern Africa Development Community (SADC) countries, including Zimbabwe and South Africa.[23] As of April 2008, the GCPP and the ACPP have been merged in a single Conflict Prevention Pool (CPP). The main instruments of SSR are:

(1) courses funded under defence diplomacy and military education courses

(2) police and intelligence advice and training through police training bodies and other resources

(3) the Defence Advisory Team (DAT), which offers advice and assistance to recipient countries engaged in drawing up defence policy reviews, provides financial management support and advice on civil-military relations

(4) the Global Facilitation Network (GFN), a research, advisory and mobilisation tool for the UK government and its international partners.[24] The GFN's function is to facilitate policy development and capacity building in the field of SSR.

Germany has also established structures of coordination among the government ministries involved in SSR. Within the Development Ministry (Bundesministerium fuer wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung, [BMZ]), a working group on SSR was founded in 2004 as part of the Department for Civil Crisis Prevention. This working group coordinates discussions among personnel from all the relevant ministries (BMZ, Ministry of Defence, Foreign Ministry and Ministry of the Interior) and in 2006 was responsible for drawing

up an inter-ministerial working paper on SSR.[25] It has also been charged with identifying a pilot country for German SSR activities and initiating activities that could test the efficacy of coordination mechanisms among departments and ministries. Indonesia was chosen, but results to date have been modest: according to German government sources, the German side has found it difficult to engage Indonesian actors, especially the military.

The five Nordic countries – Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway and Sweden – have instigated a framework within the so-called Nordic Initiative for a coordinated and combined approach to their SSR activities; however, these focus not on Africa but on the Western Balkan countries of Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Macedonia, Montenegro and Serbia (now also including Ukraine).[26] As small countries with limited resources, the Nordic states have recognised the need to achieve synergy by combining their efforts. In other donor countries (e.g. Canada, the United States of America [USA], Sweden, the Netherlands, France), efforts have been made to create inter-ministerial or inter-agency bodies, or strengthen existing coordination mechanisms across ministries, in order to coordinate international reconstruction and stabilisation efforts. Although these mechanisms have not explicitly been set up to deal with SSR and have wider competencies than SSR, they are often also responsible for SSR-related activities.[27]

Thus a number of major players have put coordinating mechanisms in place, but there is significant variation between them in terms of their commitment to securing inter-ministerial cooperation and a coherent approach. The UK appears to have gone furthest in this regard, while the Nordic countries stand out as a model of regional coordination. A rather less coherent approach appears to have been adopted by the United States, where several ministries and agencies are conducting SSR with inadequate coordination, including the Department of Defence, the Drug Enforcement Agency, the Department of Justice (DoJ) and the Department of State.[28]

Donor activities in Africa

How far is the new SSR paradigm reflected in the donor approach to the practice of SSR on the ground? The appendix presents information on SSR programmes in Africa with support from bilateral donors and multilateral institutions. It is

compiled from open sources (mainly agencies' websites and SSR-related publications) together with interviews, and excludes projects on demobilisation, disarmament and reintegration (DDR) as well as on control of small arms and light weapons (SALW). This is because such projects are often viewed as necessary prior steps creating appropriate conditions for, rather than forming an integral part of, SSR activities. The appendix makes no claim to be comprehensive, but rather serves an illustrative purpose, which allows for the identification of certain tendencies. Thus, it becomes apparent from Table 1 that the UK is particularly active in SSR in Africa, with by far the largest number of projects, followed by the USA and Germany. Of all donor countries involved in SSR, the UK comes closest to the OECD-DAC's vision of SSR, taking seriously the holistic imperative and working with the various segments of the security sector. This is particularly evident in the UK's involvement in Sierra Leone, but also, to a lesser extent, in UK-financed programmes in Malawi and Nigeria that encompass police and justice reform. Normative elements of SSR are clearly discernible in the UK-supported Defence Review in Uganda, which was accompanied by a public information campaign and seeks to improve oversight, transparency and accountability within the Ugandan Ministry of Defence and Armed Forces. Germany has a clear focus on policing reforms, especially the support of community policing initiatives, while the USA's activities are largely in the field of military training, but also include support for police reforms.

Despite having traditionally strong ties to agencies of the security sector in its former African colonies, France can be regarded as something of a latecomer to the SSR paradigm.[29] A certain French reticence towards the concept of SSR could be attributed to a number of factors: SSR was originally championed by the UK, and France has its own traditional approach to security issues as well as a close (and often secretive) relationship with ruling elites and defence establishments in many of its former colonies. The British, Nordic, German, Swiss and US-American dominance is very noticeable in the literature on SSR; there are very few studies by French analysts or published in French.[30] However, gradual changes in the French attitude are discernible, possibly propelled by the 2007 change in government, the work of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee, and the fact that SSR has become prominent on the agenda both of the European Union (EU) and of the United Nations (UN).[31]

Other industrialised countries, such as Canada, Switzerland, the Netherlands, and Norway are also involved in SSR activities. The appendix almost certainly under-represents their contribution in this area, since their engagement frequently takes place under the umbrella of multilateral institutions rather than in bilateral programmes. In the case of Norway, for example, direct support for governance issues related to the security sector has been limited; instead Norway is engaged via multilateral organisations and NGOs. There is, however, some bilateral Norwegian support in SADC countries to strengthen parliaments, public watchdog committees, the media, and public financial management and anti-corruption bodies.[32] Similarly, the Netherlands is an important donor to SSR activities in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC) under the auspices of various United Nations system organisations.[33] Equally, some external actors with significant bilateral projects are also committed to multilateral SSR projects, as in the case of the UK's contribution to UN Development Programme's (UNDP) law and security programme in Somalia.

The Council of the European Union adopted a concept for the support of security sector reforms through the European Security and Defence Policy (ESDP) in 2005, while the European Commission presented a concept of its own in the following year. These two concepts constitute the framework for a European engagement in the realm of SSR; they reflect somewhat differing approaches that could usefully be merged. In 2005, The EU established an advisory and assistance mission for security sector reform in the Democratic Republic of Congo (EUSEC).[34] Currently, the EU is considering an ESDP advice and assistance mission in support of security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau.[35]

United Nations SSR activities in Africa are generally coordinated by the local UN Mission or the UNDP. The Security Council has stressed "that the United Nations has a crucial role to play in promoting comprehensive, coherent and coordinated international support to nationally owned security sector reform programmes, implemented with the consent of the countries concerned", [36] and is increasingly including SSR-related issues in peacekeeping mandates. SSR matters were addressed in Security Council resolutions creating the United Nations Integrated Office in Sierra Leone (UNIOSIL) and the United Nations Integrated Office in Burundi (BINUB). Reference to SSR was also made in resolutions on mandate renewal of the UN Mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUC) and the UN Operation in Cote d'Ivoire (UNOCI); furthermore, the

UN missions in Liberia (UNMIL) and Sudan (UNMIS) also refer explicitly or implicitly to aspects of SSR.[37] The UNDP has been involved in the development of the Malian Code of Conduct for the Malian armed forces and has assumed responsibility for reform of the police service in Liberia and Sierra Leone.[38]

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are reticent with regard to SSR. Following their mandate, they refrain from direct involvement in security issues and rather emphasise transparency and management of the security sector.[39] The focus of both the World Bank and the IMF is on the level of military expenditure, an approach that has been criticised for focusing on just one component of the security sector and ignoring broader governance questions.[40] The World Bank is involved in the Multi-Country Demobilization and Reintegration Programme (MDRP) for the Great Lakes Region, encompassing Angola, Burundi, the Central African Republic, the DRC, the Republic of the Congo, Rwanda and Uganda. This programme includes DDR and de-mining programmes and also, through the Governance Capacity Enhancement Project, seeks to strengthen security governance beyond these two areas.[41] The World Bank does not play a significant operative role but has published policy papers suggesting appropriate donor policies with respect to SSR initiatives. These proposals are broadly similar to the approach developed in recent years by the OECD-DAC, although they lack the strong focus on local ownership and say nothing about gender issues in SSR.[42]

In terms of the regional distribution of SSR projects with external support in Africa, Table 1 shows that the majority of SSR activities are conducted in West Africa (especially in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Ghana, and Nigeria) and in East Africa (above all in Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania). Former French colonies and North Africa are conspicuously under-represented. Some countries have attracted the support of a large number of external donors (Table 2). These include states with an evident and acute need of SSR (DRC), and others that have already made very significant advances in this area (South Africa), where external donor involvement would appear to reflect the capacity of the state to absorb external resources and to implement reform. Where one or few external donors are involved in projects of limited scope, the comprehensive approach to SSR seems doubtful. Thus, whether the USA's programme of army reform in Mali or the UK's scholarships in "defence diplomacy" in Zambia can properly be regarded as examples of the new paradigm appears questionable. Table 3

summarises the regional scope of external actors' involvement in SSR in Africa. It shows that the UK's involvement extends to a significant number of countries, followed by the USA and Germany. In some cases, this may reflect a "relabelling" of traditional forms of police and/or military assistance rather than a new, encompassing approach. Notable is the role of South Africa, which has been involved in the reform of Nigeria's Ministry of Defence and is also an important source of ideas on SSR through various "think tanks". As the tables show, there are comparatively few donor-funded projects that aim at strengthening dialogue, coordination and capacity-building at a regional level.

Summing up the preceding survey of donor activities, it is apparent, first, that security sector reform is by no means given the same priority by all donor countries and agencies. Second, most programmes seem not to reflect the holistic approach emphasised by the conceptual literature on SSR. How far the rather segmented approach revealed in the table is rendered a coherent overall strategy, via coordinating mechanisms among donors set up under the OECD Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness, seems an open question.[43] The difference in donor approaches and practice is immense.[44]

Two cases of comprehensive SSR? Donor policy in Sierra Leone and Liberia

The cases of Sierra Leone and Liberia can be viewed as model cases offering the opportunity to analyse donor aproaches to comprehensive security sector reconstruction.[45] Sierra Leone's SSR process is widely seen as a test case of SSR with strong external support and one of the few cases of a genuinely holistic approach to SSR.[46] It is also one of the cases that has attracted most research.[47] SSR in Liberia is at the forefront of the SSR debate at the present[48] and one could argue that the lessons learnt from Sierra Leone could be useful for post-conflict SSR measures in Liberia: the countries are neighbours and suffered comparable types of armed conflict with similar causes[49]. In both countries, the SSR process depends heavily on external donors.

Sierra Leone's state security infrastructure had become totally dysfunctional at the end of the civil war, and even before the war it had been marked by the features discussed above: its control of the country's territory was incomplete, and it served the ruling elites rather than the security interests of the people. In large parts of the country, especially during the civil war, security was provided by local civil defence forces, rebel groups and secret societies, which were a source of security for some citizens and of insecurity for others.[50] In 1999, the UN set up the UN Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) to assist in the implementation of the Lomé Peace Accord (1999) and the disarmament, demobilisation and reintegration plan. UNAMSIL, with its 17 000 troops, completed its mandate in 2005 and was succeeded by UNIOSIL, established by the Security Council to help consolidate the fragile peace. During the civil war, the UK's involvement was highly ambivalent. UK government officials were aware of a major arms deal (in breach of UN resolutions) by the private military company Sandline International in 1996, aimed at helping bring Ahmed Kabbah back to power.[51] When violence flared up again in 2000 and 500 UN peacekeepers were held hostage by rebel forces, the UK intervened with troops under its own command, despite pleas by Sierra Leone to commit troops to the UN. Following the end of the civil war, the UK's DFID earmarked 20 million pounds to carry out SSR from 1999 to 2002. At the same time, the UK signed a 10-year collaboration plan with Sierra Leone for reconstruction and poverty alleviation. The SSR programme, mainly funded and managed by DFID, had the following objectives: the creation of effective, affordable and democratically accountable security institutions; effective reconciliation, justice and reintegration of ex-combatants; and the reduction of regional threats to Sierra Leone.[52]

The civil war in neighbouring Liberia ended in 2003 after 14 years of armed conflict, with deployment of ECOWAS (Economic Community of West African States) peacekeepers and the signing of the Comprehensive Peace Agreement (CPA). Liberia had been systematically dominated by so called Americo-Liberian settlers and their descendants since its founding in 1822, even though they only constituted five per cent of the overall population. This resulted in Liberia effectively functioning as a one-party state for more than a century (1877-1980) and in widespread political repression, nepotism, economic mismanagement and political and socio-economic marginalisation of the majority of the people.[53] Personalisation of power became common in the decades preceding the civil

war. After Samuel Doe, who came to power in 1980 through a military coup, tried to replace Americo-Liberian settler domination by privileging his own tribe — the Krahns, especially within the army — the National Patriotic Front of Liberia (NPFL) began an armed rebellion. The subsequent civil war devastated society, the economy and what state structures were in existence before the outbreak of armed conflict. Reform of the security sector needed to address several issues, including disbanding the several non-state armed groups; restructuring the state military forces; depoliticising and demilitarising the police; and putting an end to impunity, corruption and political interference in the judiciary.[54] UNMIL – with 15000 UN soldiers, the world's second-largest UN peace operation after Sierra Leone – has been primarily responsible for upholding the fragile peace. Liberia's SSR agenda was outlined in the CPA of 2003. The CPA gave powers to the international community and specifically requested the USA to play a leading role. The responsibility for the implementation and funding of SSR in Liberia is shared among various UN agencies, the US government and the Liberian government.

Holistic approach

SSR in Sierra Leone represents a rare case of a comprehensive initiative and is frequently cited as an example of good practice.[55] With the use of the UK's ACCP, the Sierra Leonean SSR case was one of the first to be conducted with the help of a formal mechanism for coordination, both among government departments (DFID, FCO, MoD) in the leading donor nation and with other donors. Reflecting the UK's broad approach to SSR, reform measures in Sierra Leone were designed to encompass the army and the police, the justice sector, intelligence and the Anti-Corruption Commission. Despite this, complete coherence was not achieved, in part due to differing conceptions among external actors (e.g. contrasting policing models between the UK and the UN), and in part due to competition for resources among local actors in Sierra Leone.[56] Thus, while a holistic approach is clearly discernible on the conceptual level and efforts have been made to steer implementation in this direction, the full potential of an integrated SSR reform has not been realised.

Liberia's SSR agenda, as outlined in the CPA, is more narrowly conceived than the OECD's comprehensive definition of SSR.[57] It deals with DDR, the restructuring and reform of the military, the national police, and other state security institutions. Statements regarding the strengthening of civilian oversight, judicial and penal reform and local participation in SSR are conspicuous by their absence from the CPA. There is no single external actor coordinating SSR, but each looks after its turf. The US has assumed control of army reform and in turn outsourced its commitment to the private military companies DynCorp International and Pacific Architects and Engineers (PAE) in 2005, which exclusively have the task of recruiting, training and restructuring the armed forces of Liberia.[58] Responsibility for police reform was originally assumed by UNMIL but recently DynCorp has been assigned to train 500 Liberia National Police members[59]. Conceptually, the US embraces a comprehensive approach to SSR, but in practice it has devoted little attention and resources to the non-defence, non-military components of SSR.[60] The reform of the security sector has to date been poorly coordinated: a multiplicity of actors have been operating in a fragmented manner.[61] SSR has virtually been reduced to army and police reform. UNMIL has dedicated considerable resources to justice reform; but a conceptual link to other aspects of SSR appears weak.

Local ownership and democratic participation

Local ownership of donor assisted projects has become a central tenet of international development cooperation and was re-emphasised in the OECD's 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness. Given that security reforms go to the heart of sovereignty, local ownership of such reforms seems even more compelling. However, despite the lip service paid to local ownership, there is little agreement on the meaning and scope of the concept, especially as applied to SSR.[62] We follow the OECD-DAC understanding of local ownership requiring that solutions to problems are developed locally;[63] this fairly emphatic understanding of local ownership is, in theory, the common approach of OECD nations to SSR support. We also share Ebo's view that local actors do not constitute a homogeneous group of actors, that "local ownership" is not synonymous with "local executive ownership", and that the legislature and civil society actors are among the groups that need to be included in the SSR process in order to ensure genuine local ownership.[64]

Following the end of the civil war, a security review was commissioned with a broad remit. This included identifying the main threats to Sierra Leone's political, social and economic development, identifying the institutions relevant to countering such threats, and developing appropriate strategies to deal with them. The review was managed by a secretariat from the Office of National Security (ONS), with support from DFID and the UK's DAT. Media reporting on the review was encouraged in order to generate public interest, and consultation was sought with parliamentary committees, executive bodies and government departments, as well as with the central institutions of the state security apparatus. The latter included the police, the military, prisons, customs and immigration authorities, the judicial system, the Truth and Reconciliation Commission, and civil society organisations. Such organisations included traditional rulers, religious groups, academics, professional societies and ex-combatants, whose voices were heard in a series of country-wide consultative workshops. One of the outcomes of the process was the creation of District and Provincial Security Committees intended to incorporate the population into Sierra Leone's security structures and enhance accountability and transparency. These committees were also intended to play an early warning role and thus to improve the provision of security. Consultations with such a wide array of groups within the country, as well as media coverage, ensured a great deal of input from society into the process and an unusually high degree of local participation from very different civil society actors.

Despite this broad consultative process, a number of analysts question whether Sierra Leone's SSR process can be regarded as a case of full local ownership. The UK made a very heavy commitment of both personnel and funding, essential in a country ranked one of the poorest in the world and whose post-civil war security sector has been variously described as comatose or consisting only of shattered remnants. Inevitably, the UK had "a defining impact on the SSR process".[65] Contrasting views of Sierra Leone's security requirements are likely to be settled in favour of the British position, given Sierra Leone's dependence on external funding.

In the case of Liberia, there is a consensus that the international community has failed to respect the principle of local ownership.[66] In the transition phase, ownership meant the incorporation of the provisional government and the warring parties into SSR. The process was driven by external actors such as the USA,

UNMIL and private military and security companies. A security review, the basis for SSR measures, was undertaken by RAND Corporation, an American think tank.[67] In contrast to the broad participation in Sierra Leone's review process, in Liberia, civil society and even some of the security agencies themselves were not aware of this.[68] Until now, there has been no national dialogue on the content of the security review. Rebuilding of the AFL has been especially criticised for the lack of local input: the US was requested to play a leading role and in turn delegated this task in 2005 to the US-American private security and military companies DynCorp International and PAE.[69] DynCorp has refused to report to the Liberian parliament, citing its contractual obligations towards the US State Department. The arrangement between the Liberian government, the US and the private military companies implementing the army reform, and the definition of nature, content and character of Liberia's new armed forces without consultation of the parliament or civil society, is evidence of a serious lack of transparency in the SSR process. Both government officials and civil society groups voice their concern about a lack of local ownership, and call for a "Liberianising" of the process.[70] Recently, civil society organisations have taken the initiative by starting a dialogue on SSR and calling for civil society to be part of the process. These initiatives may yet succeed in broadening local participation in SSR, but civil society has not been incorporated into the government's reform framework.[71] The case of Liberia illustrates the common tendency to posit a tension between the principle of efficiency and the principles of legality, transparency and accountability. This tendency applies to the SSR process as a whole and, in particular, to the reform of the armed forces.

People-centred security

Conceptual writings on SSR emphasise its commitment to people-centred and individual security, and this implies sensitivity to the specific security needs and vulnerabilities of different segments of society, including a recognition of the gendered nature of security arrangements and their differing impact on men and women. With regard to SSR in Sierra Leone, policy statements all indicate a more people-centred understanding of security, which must be acknowledged as a break with Sierra Leone's history of exclusive and abusive security institutions that justified arbitrary violence in the name of national stability.[72] Important elements of the security structure for bridging the gap between the population

and the state institutions are the above-mentioned decentralised District and Provinicial Security Committees. The SSR process in Sierra Leone also incorporated a gender perspective. Provision was made for the appointment of women into senior positions within the armed forces. Within the police department, a family support unit was set up, including female police personnel, and leading to higher reporting rates of sexual and physical violence against women. Police were trained on how to deal with crimes of this nature.[73] Despite these elements, which represent a piecemeal approach rather than a coherent overall strategy, an evaluation found that gender was not well represented in SSR in Sierra Leone.[74] Two years after the transition, complaints about insensitivity to gender-based violence and the failure to investigate rape and domestic violence were frequent.[75] This latter finding is open to various interpretations: one is that it may be that the reform process opened a space where such complaints could at least be articulated, thus enabling activists to highlight gender-specific security issues.

The Liberia National Police (LNP) cannot to date be considered effective. Physical insecurity is widespread, and the high rates of gender-based violence and armed robbery in Monrovia are a few of the most pressing problems.[76] Notwithstanding the high level of threat to physical integrity, some developments in Liberia point in a positive direction with regard to people-centred security: "However ineffective the LNP may be, the fact that it is actually deployed and doing some visible policing without instilling fear in communities may be considered major progress."[77] Popular trust in the police appears to have risen since the end of the war: in a survey of 2005–6, the LNP was named second most frequently (after UNMIL) as the most important institution for guaranteeing people's personal safety. However, the national police lacks the capacity to provide security without assistance from other forces, so in addition to UNMIL, this gap is partly filled by so called Community Watch Teams, which operate at a community level.[78]

In the new judiciary framework, rape is now considered a serious crime punishable with the maximum sentence. All in all, sexualised violence against women is now discussed more openly in Liberia. Furthermore, as part of UNMIL's activities a police unit from India has been training women, which has led to more recruitment of female police personnel and is seen as enhancing police responsivity to gender-specific security issues. Liberian security sector and

government structures in general are more open to women, partly due to the conviction of Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, Liberia's president since 2006, that women have an important role to play in Liberia's peace- and statebuilding efforts. UNMIL is also evidently influenced by the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security (2000). From its inception, UNMIL has had an Office to the Gender Advisor which assists in mainstreaming gender into all aspects of the UN mission. However, in Liberia as well as in Sierra Leone the involvement of women in the peacebuilding process followed a familiar pattern: initially there was a high degree of engagement, but "once the machinery of peace begins, the impetus of women and their competencies and contributions are completely overlooked…".[79] This leads to the conclusion that women's rights and security needs can all too easily become sidelined in a technocratic, managerial approach to SSR.

SSR compared in Sierra Leone and Liberia

The approaches to SSR discernible in Sierra Leone and Liberia are clearly very different. The comparison between the two cases serves to highlight the positive effects that SSR's novel elements can have. But the analysis also reveals the limited impact of major statements on SSR, such as the OECD-DAC's conceptual work in this area, in cases where donors and recipients are not amenable to the fundamental guiding principles that inform the concept of SSR. Reviewing the two cases, it is apparent that, in Sierra Leone, there has been and continues to be a serious attempt at comprehensive reform encompassing not merely the military and police institutions, but also intelligence agencies and the criminal justice system. This comprehensive approach was furthered by a comparatively high degree of coordination both among relevant actors in Sierra Leone and between the government departments of the main donor country, the UK. Although problems of coordination among different actors remain, SSR in Sierra Leone broadly conforms to the holistic undestanding of SSR propagated by the OECD-DAC. In Liberia, in contrast, SSR has been criticised for its narrow focus on only two elements of the security sector: the military and the police. With regard to local ownership and democratic participation in the SSR process, the case of Sierra Leone again demonstrates a fairly high level of both, whereas Liberia shows all local actors except the executive being marginalised from the SSR process. The contracting out of major elements of the

reform to foreign private security and military companies, themselves largely unaccountable to public scrutiny, has made it extremely difficult for the legislative body and civil society actors to exercise any kind of monitoring function, let alone have a genuine input into security policy. People-centred security is reflected in Sierra Leone in the establishment of security committees that give the population a channel to voice security concerns, and both countries have gone some way towards rectifying gender imbalance in their police forces and ensuring that crimes of sexualised violence are treated seriously. Although, in both cases, some positive developments can be noted, the significant differences between them cast doubt on the impact of initiatives like the OECD-DAC SSR standards.

Conclusions

Drawing conclusions about the practice of SSR is not easy, as there is a serious lack of empirical research. What is especially needed is rigorously comparative research with analytical depth. Most empirical studies on SSR currently in existence, although certainly providing a wealth of data and some interesting insights, are often largely descriptive; the categories of analysis and the evaluation criteria often remain somewhat unclear, making it difficult to judge the success of SSR initiatives, the standards by which such success is measured, and the comparative performance of different programmes. Moreover, many of the available studies emanate from experts who are themselves directly involved in policy formulation and implementation, rather than being independent. Broad conclusions about the effectiveness of SSR therefore need to be made with caution; however, we believe that a few generalisations can safely be extracted from the foregoing survey of SSR in Africa.

Almost five years ago, Michael Brzoska observed that the popularity of the term "SSR" had not led to its widespread application in practice and drew attention to "the lack of instances of security sector reform on the ground".[80] Broadly speaking, this seems as true now as it was then, and certainly applies to SSR in Africa, where more recent assessments have drawn attention to the same notable gap between policy and practice with regard to SSR in Africa.[81] The co-ordinated, holistic approach as promoted by OECD-DAC and other institutions is rarely

found in practice. Where such an approach has been attempted, it was almost always after the end of violent conflict concentrating – as in Sierra Leone and Liberia – on so-called "failed states". Instead of the comprehensive approach the conceptual literature posits as being a definitive feature of SSR, reform of the security sector is frequently seen in narrow institutional terms focusing on one segment (army, police, intelligence, justice etc.), "characterised by few linkages across security institutions, let alone linkages to oversight institutions or civilian agencies."[82] In general, defence and police reform are given more attention than other sections of the security sector. Local ownership is frequently reduced to a question of securing the agreement of local governments to programmes and strategies devised by foreign donors.[83] The principles of transparency and accountability are not, in practice, treated as centrally important; Liberia's military reform offers the most glaring example of this. And, finally, the emphasis on community and individual security — which implies dialogue with precisely those communities and individuals affected by the security arrangements, in order to discern their perceptions of their own security needs and give them genuine input into and control over reform — also seems to be underdeveloped in many practical applications of SSR.

In practice, then, SSR in Africa has not yet realised its potential, and donor projects labelled SSR do not always greatly differ from the previous piecemeal and uncoordinated approach donors have traditionally adopted towards defence, policing and justice reform. In some ways, the insistence on the nexus between security and development may actually have strengthened the influence of foreign military establishments at the expense of the civilian development donor community. The danger exists that development cooperation will be increasingly securitised, that is, seen increasingly as a security issue that is appropriately dealt with by security institutions – the exact opposite of the concept's original intention, which was to make security an issue on the development cooperation agenda. Perhaps the most striking example of the effects of this securitization is the growing role of the Pentagon in U.S. foreign aid programmes: it now accounts for over 20% of US official development assistance (ODA), beyond the resources it deploys in non-ODA assistance that are directed towards training and equipping foreign military forces.[84] Although the greater part of US ODA goes to Iraq and Afghanistan, the Pentagon is also expanding its role to include activities hitherto undertaken by the State Department,

the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), and civilian bodies, including NGOs. The establishment of the new United States Africa Command (AFRICOM), with the potential to override civilian programmes, is a clear example of this tendency.[85] At best, this form of "mission creep" entails giving military authorities responsibility over development projects that are essentially civilian; at worst, it runs the risk that long-term development goals, including SSR, are subordinated to the perceived short-term security interests of a foreign power.

Should the concept of SSR, then, be dismissed as a case of false packaging? We suggest that it should not; rather, donors need to be held to their avowed principles. They also need to learn from successful endeavours in the field of SSR that have largely been conceived and executed without foreign assistance. South Africa's reforms in the fields of defence and internal security stand out as an example of a genuinely inclusive and comprehensive approach. The South African experience indicates that a long-term approach is necessary, and that external development donors, if they are serious about SSR, will need to take such a long view.

Experiences with security sector reform in Latin America, following the democratisation process that took hold on that continent from the 1980s onwards, also indicate that far-reaching reform is a long-term process in which each step builds on previous achievements.[86] In general, there is an urgent need for greater donor sensitivity to the various experiences of recipient countries. It is to be welcomed that new networks are being established to strengthen the South's voice in the SSR debate. One of these is the African Security Sector Network (ASSN), created in 2003 with participation from countries from across the continent. The Network aims to increase Africa's voice in the SSR debate, pointing out that SSR at present mainly reflects donor views and needs.[87] This donor bias is evident in the exclusive focus of the SSR debate on the reform needs of countries in the global South, while major deficits in the advanced industrialised countries, including a general lack of transparency, arms exports, and discriminatory policies with regard to immigrants, remain outside of the SSR dialogue. This is a serious lack, the more so since these problems of security governance in the OECD countries have a direct bearing on security arrangements in the

South. Moreover, a critical review of security governance in the industrialised world suggests that donors often proclaim higher standards for development aid recipients than they themselves care to establish.

Listening to, and fully incorporating, voices from the South could help overcome the undoubted Eurocentrism of current SSR practices. Despite the OECD-DAC's insistence on context sensitivity, the matrix for SSR too often seems to be an idealised version of the Weberian and democratic state – an ideal to which donor countries themselves do not conform. With regard to SSR processes in Africa, external actors need to be more aware of the potential of non-state actors and informal mechanisms and institutions that have no counterparts in Western societies and can therefore all too easily be lost from view. Non-state, informal structures and coping mechanisms that have always played a part in security arrangements in African societies need to be fully incorporated into SSR programmes. This implies a recognition of the much higher prevalence of non-state security actors in many African countries, from armed groups to non-state dispensers of justice. Western concepts, for all their talk of local ownership and sensitivity to local contexts, seem to find it difficult to incorporate such actors into their vision of SSR. Similarly, the inclusion of civil society actors, if it takes place at all, tends to focus on organisational forms readily recognisable from Western societies, such as formally-constituted NGOs. Dissimilar structures (clans, families, councils of elders etc., and newer organisational forms such as social movements and neighbourhood self-help groups) may easily be overlooked or underestimated by Western donors involved in SSR projects.

In general, then, SSR remains a concept with innovative and emancipatory potential. Its emphasis on participation, transparency, accountability and the provision of security for all within the rule of law, make it an approach that should transcend the more narrow concerns of traditional military and police assistance, based largely on the search for "effectiveness" or "efficiency" (often defined in terms of regime security) with little or no concern for the normative criteria that inform the concept of SSR. For the potential of SSR to become reality, however, the debate needs to become global, rather than including only experts from the industrialised world. The latter should be reminded of the potential inherent in the holistic and normatively-inspired concept of SSR, and

be held to the conviction that security is essential for development, rather than allowing development issues to become subordinated to the developed world's own security concerns.

Endnotes

1 Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development – Development Assistance Committee [OECD-DAC] (2005), Security system reform and governance. DAC Guidelines and Reference Series. Paris: OECD.

2 Department for International Development [DFID] (1999), Poverty and the security sector. Policy statement, London: DFID; Department for International Development (2000), Security sector reform: Review of the role of external actors. Discussion Paper 2, London: DFID; Department for International Development (2002), Understanding and supporting security sector reform. London: DFID; Brzoska, Michael (2003), Development Donors and the Concept of Security Sector Reform. Geneva: Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces (DCAF) (DCAF Occasional Paper, No. 4).

3 Brzoska, (2003) [note 2], p. 4.

4 Brzoska, Michael (2003) [note 2], p. 4; DFID (2002), Understanding and supporting security sector reform [Note 2].

5 OECD-DAC (2005), Security system reform and governance [note 1].

6 Ibid.; OECD-DAC (2007), Handbook on security system reform. Supporting security and justice. Paris: OECD.

7 International Action Network on Small Arms (IANSA) / Oxfam International / Saferworld (2007), Africa's missing billions. International arms flow and the cost of conflict, Oxfam Briefing Paper 107. Available at: <http://oxfam.intelli-direct.com>. Accessed on: 6 January 2008.

8 Williams, Ishola (2007), "The challenges of security sector reform in West Africa", in L. le Roux and T. Kidane, eds., *Challenges to security sector reform in the Horn of Africa*, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies (ISS), pp. 37-50.

9 Ebo Adedeji (2007), Towards a common ECOWAS agenda on security sector reform, Geneva: DCAF (DCAF Policy Paper 23).

10 Legwaila, Joseph Legwaila (2003), "Security sector reform in Africa: relevance to peace building, in: United Nations Office at Geneva (UNOG)-DCAF, eds., *Security sector reform: its relevance for conflict prevention, peace building, and development*. Geneva: DCAF, pp. 34-38. Available at: <http://se2.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 15 January 2008.

11 Williams, Rocklyn (2000), "Africa and the challenges of security sector reform, in J. Cilliers and A. Hilding-Norberg, eds., *Building stability in Africa: challenges for the new millenium,* Pretoria: ISS. Available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 14 May 2007.

12 Ukeje, Charles (2005), "Rethinking Africa's security in the age of uncertain globalisation – NEPAD and human security in the 21st century", paper submitted to the 11th CODESRIA General Assembly, Maputo, Mozambique, 6-10 December. Available at: <http://ww.codesria.org>. Accessed on: 31 January 2008. The same point was made by Adedeji Ebo in interview with Daniel Bendix, Geneva, 22 November 2007.

13 Lalá, Anícia (2004), "Picturing the landscape: police, justice, penal and intelligence reforms in Africa", in C. Ferguson and J.O. Isima, eds., *Providing security for people – enhancing security through police, justice and intelligence reform in Africa*, Shrivenham: Global Facilitation Network-SSR, pp. 3-18, p. 14.

14 On plural security provision see e.g. Ebo, Adedeji (2007), "The role of SSR in sustainable development: donor trends and challenges", *Conflict, Security and Development*, 7/1, pp. 27-60; Richards, Anna and Smith, Henry (2007), Addressing the role of private security companies within security sector reform programmes, London: International Alert. Available at: <http://saferworld.org.uk>. Accessed on: 15 January 2008; Petri, Jack (2002), The role of private military companies in security sector reform. Available at: <http://www.isn.ethz.ch>. Accessed on: 6 January 2008; Isima, Jeffrey (2007), "Regulating the private security sector – an imperative for security sector governance in Africa", *Journal of Security Sector Management*, 5/1. Available at: <http://www.ssronline.org>. Accessed on: 17 January 2008; Abrahamsen, Rita and Williams, Michael (2006), "Security sector reform. Bringing the private in", *Conflict, Security and Development*, 6/1, pp. 1-23.

15 Baker, Bruce and Scheye, Eric (2007), Supporting state and non-state provision of security and justice. Available at: http://www.ssrnetwork.net. Accessed on: 7 May 2008.

16 Hutchful, Eboe and Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2005), "Security system reform in Africa", in OECD-DAC, ed., *Security system reform and governance*. Paris: OECD, pp. 71-90, at p. 74.

17 Bryden, Alan, N'Diaye, Boubacar and Olonisakin, 'Funmi (2005), Security sector governance in West Africa: turning principles to practice. Geneva: DCAF (DCAF Policy Paper No. 8). Available at: <http://www.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 20 June 2007; Lalá, Anícia (2004), "Picturing the landscape", [Note 13], p. 5.

18 Hutchful, Eboe and Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2005), "Security system reform in Africa" [Note 16] at p. 71, p. 74.

19 Among them, Tanzania under Julius Nyerere, Senegal under Léopold Sédar Senghor, and Ghana under Kwame Nkrumah. See ibid, p. 77.

20 Hendricks, Cheryl (2008), "Die Weiterentwicklung der Agenda der menschlichen Sicherheit. Afrikanische Perspektiven", in C. Ulbert and S. Werthes, eds., *Menschliche Sicherheit. Globale Herausforderungen und regionale Perspektiven*. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 137-148.

21 Ukeje, Charles (2005), "Rethinking Africa's security" [Note 12] at pp. 20-21.

22 DFID (2004), The Africa conflict prevention pool – a joint UK government aproach to preventing and reducing conflict in sub-Saharan Africa. Available at: <htp://www.dfid.gov.uk>. Accessed on: 15 October 2007.

23 Hutchful, Eboe and Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2005), "Security system reform in Africa' [Note 16] at p. 82.

24 DFID / MoD / FCO (2004), Security sector reform strategy, available at: <http://www.gsdrc.org>. Accessed on: 27 May 2008.

25 Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ) (2006), Interministerielles Rahmenkonzept zur Unterstuetzung von Reformen des Sicherheitssektors in Entwicklungs- und Transformationslaendern. Available at: <http://www.bmz.de>. Accessed on: 7 May 2008.

26 Neretniks, Karlis and Kaljurand, Riina (2007), Security sector reform: a Nordic-Baltic agenda. Available at: <http://www2.foi.se>. Accessed on: 22 June 2008.

27 Clingendael (2008), Towards a whole-of-government approach to security system reform, conference background paper, The Hague, 9-10 April 2008, at p. 5. Available at: <http://www.clingendael.nl>. Accessed on: 28 May 2008.

28 Wulf, Herbert (2004), Security sector reform in developing and transitional countries, in C. McCarthy, M. Fischer, and O. Wils, eds., *Security sector reform. Potentials and challenges for conflict transformation,* Berlin: Berghof Research Center for Constructive Conflict Management, pp. 9-27, at p. 18.

29 Ibid, also Alan Bryden, DCAF, Geneva, in interview with Daniel Bendix, 22 November 2007.

30 For exceptions see Vitalis, Joseph (2004), "La réforme du secteur de sécurité en Afrique", *Afrique Contemporaine*, 1/209, pp. 65-79, available at: <http://www.cairn.info>. Accessed on: 8 January 2008; Chataigner, Jean-Marc (2006), La réforme du secteur de sécurité dans les États et societés fragiles. Préalable indispensable au développement, ou dernière des illusions néocoloniales?, *Afrique Contemporaine*, 2/218, pp. 101-117; Koerner, Wolfgang (2006), Réforme du secteur de la sécurité: la diplomatie de la défense, Service d'information et de recherche parlementaires. Available at: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>. Accessed on: 20 May 2008; Sebahara, Pamphile (2006), La réforme du secteur de la securité en RD Congo, Note d'Analyse, GRIP-Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Available at: <http://www.grip.org>. Accessed on: 17 May 2007.

31 Interview Daniel Bendix with Alan Bryden, Geneva, 22 November 2007.

32 Tjønneland, Elling (2003), Norway and security sector reform in developing countries, CMI Report 12, p. 43. Available at: <http://www.cmi.no>. Accessed on: 22 January 2008.

33 UNDP Press Release, 23 April 2008. Available at: <http://www.monuc.org>. Accessed on: 27 May 2008.

34 Council of the European Union (2008), EU security reform mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo. Available at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu>. Accessed on: 01 May 2008.

35 Council of the European Union (n.d.), EU mission in suport of security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau. Available at: <http://www.consilium.europa.eu>. Accessed on: 01 May 2008.

36 United Nations Security Council (2007), Security sector reform in post-conflict states critical to consolidating peace. SC/8958, 20 February 2007. Available at: <http://www.un.org>. Accessed on: 28 May 2007.

37 See the relevant Security Council resolutions: S/RES/1509, 19 September 2003 (establishing UNMIL); S/RES/1565, 1 October 2004 (making SSR part of MONUC's mandate); S/RES/1590, 24 March 2005 (creating UNMIS); S/RES/1620, 31 August 2005 (creating UNIOSIL); S/RES/1693, 30 June 2006 (reaffirming MONUC's mandate to support SSR); S/RES/1719, 25 October 2006 (creating BINUB); S/RES/1721, 1 November 2006 (including SSR in UNOCI's activities); S/RES/1739, 10 January 2007 (strengthening UNOCI's role in SSR).

38 Hutchful, Eboe and Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2005), "Security system reform in Africa" [Note 16], p. 82; Mehler, Andreas and Smith-Höhn, Judy (2007), "Security actors in Liberia and Sierra Leone – roles, interactions and perceptions", in T. Debiel and D. Lambach, eds., *State failure revisited II: actors of violence and alternative forms of governance*. Duisburg: INEF (INEF Report 89), p. 50-66 at p. 54.

39 Ball, Nicole (2001), "Transforming security sectors: the IMF and World Bank aproaches", *Journal of Conflict, Security and Development*, 1/1, pp. 45-66; Wulf, Herbert (2004), "Security sector reform in developing and transitional countries" [Note 28] at p. 17.

40 Manning, Nick and Knack, Steve (2000), Notes on the issues in using military spending as an indicator of the quality of governance, World Bank, available at: <http://www1.worldbank.org>. Accessed 28 May 2007. See also Ball, Nicole (2001) [Note 42], pp. 56-57.

41 Multi-country demobilization and reintegration programme [MDRP] (2003), Linkages between disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants and security sector reform. Position paper. Available at: <http://www.mdrp.org>. Accessed on: 17 October 2007.

42 World Bank (1999), Security, poverty reduction and sustainable development. Challenges for the new millenium. Washington DC: World Bank.

43 OECD (2005), Paris declaration on aid effectiveness. Ownership, harmonisation, alignment, results and mutual accountability. Paris: OECD.

44 Wulf, Herbert (2004) [Note 28], p. 17-18.

45 Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2004), "Governing insecurity in post-conflict states: the case of Sierra Leone and Liberia", in A. Bryden and H. Hänggi, eds., *Reform and reconstruction of the security sector*. Münster: LIT, pp. 179-205.

46 Ginifer, Jeremy (2006), "The challenge of the security sector and security reform processes in democratic transitions: the case of Sierra Leone", *Democratization* 13/5, p. 791-810.

47 For analyses of SSR in Sierra Leone see Ebo, Adedeji (2007), "Toward sustainable peace and security in Africa. The challenges of security sector reform in post-conflict Sierra Leone", in F. Aboagye, ed., *Complex emergencies in the 21st century. Challenges of new Africa's strategic peace and security policy issues*, Pretoria: ISS, pp. 49-71, available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 10 January 2008; Gbla, Osman (2006), "Security sector reform under international tutelage in Sierra Leone", *International Peacekeeping*, 13/1, pp. 78-93; Gbla, Osman (2007), "Security sector reform in Sierra Leone", in L. le Roux and Y. Kidane, eds., *Challenges to security sector reform in the Horn of Africa,*

Pretoria: ISS, p. 13-36 (ISS Monograph Series 135). Available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 14 August 2007; Mehler, Andreas and Smith-Höhn, Judy (2007), "Security actors in Liberia and Sierra Leone" [Note 38]; Conteh, Kellie (2007), "Sierra Leone case study – local ownership of the security sector review and transformation processes", in L. Nathan, ed., *No ownership, no commitment. A guide to local ownership of security sector reform*. Birmingham: University of Birmingham, p. 86-93; Ginifer, Jeremy (2006), "The Challenge of the Security Sector" [Note 46]. International Crisis Group [ICG] (2006), Liberia – staying focused, Africa Briefing 36. Available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org>. accessed 22 January 208; ICG (2007), Sierra Leone – the election opportunity, Africa Report 129, available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org>. Accessed on: 22 January 2008; Baker, Bruce (2006), "The African post-conflict policing agenda in Sierra Leone", *Conflict, Security and Development*, 6/1, pp. 25-49.

48 See e.g. Ebo, Adedeji (2005), The challenges and opportunities of security sector reform in post-conflict Liberia. Geneva: DCAF, DCAF Occasional Paper No 5. Available at: <http://www.dcaf.ch>. Accessed 26 November 2007; Ebo, Adedeji (2007), "Liberia case study: outsourcing SSR to foreign companies", in L. Nathan, ed., *No ownership, no commitment* [Note 47], pp**.** 78-85; Aboagye, Festus and Rupiya, Martin (2005), "Enhancing post-conflict democratic governance through effective security sector reform in Liberia", in F. Aboagye and A. Bah, eds., *A tortuous road to peace. The dynamics of regional, UN and international humanitarian interventions in Liberia.* Pretoria: ISS. Available at: http//www.iss.co.za. Accessed on: 12 June 2007; Omotola, J. Shola (2006), "Post-election reconstruction in Liberia: the challenges of security sector reform", Conflict Trends Issue 2, ACCORD: Durban, pp. 42-46; Andersen, Louise (2006), Post-conflict security sector reform and the challenge of ownership – the case of Liberia, DISS Brief, July. Available at: <http://www.diis.dk>. Accessed on: 26 November 2007; Gompert, David C. and Stearns, Brooke (2006), "Comprehensive security sector reform: making Liberia safe", *Africa Policy Journal*, Fall/ 2, pp. 1-27; Jaye,Thomas (2006), An assessment report on security sector reform in Liberia. KAIPTC Report 3. Available at: <http://www.kaiptc.org>. Accessed on: 26 November 2007; Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2004.), "Governing Insecurity" [Note 45].

49 Boas, Morten (2001), "Liberia and Sierra Leone - dead ringers? The logic of neopatrimonial rule", *Third World Quarterly* 22/5, pp. 697-723.

50 Mehler, Andreas and Smith-Höhn, Judy (2007) [Note 38], p. 53.

51 Musah, Abdel-Fatau (2000), "A country under siege: state decay and corporate military intervention in Sierra Leone", in A.-F. Musah and J.K. Fayemi, eds., *Mercenaries – an African security dilemma.* London and Stirling, VA: Pluto Press, pp. 76-116.

52 Ginifer, Jeremy (2004), Evaluation of the conflict prevention pools – Sierra Leone, Evaluation Report EV 647. Available at: <hww.dfid.gov.uk>. Accessed on: 20 January 2008.

53 Ebo, Adedeji (2005), Challenges and opportunities of security sector reform in post-conflict Liberia [Note 48], pp. 3-4.

54 Ibid., pp. 17-22.

55 Ginifer, Jeremy (2006), "The challenge of the security sector" [Note 46], p. 792.

56 Ebo (2007), “Towards sustainable peace and security” [Note 47].

57 Comprehensive peace agreement, 18 August 2003. Available at: <http://www.usip.org>. Accessed on: 20 June 2008.

58 Jaye, Thomas (2006), An assessment report on security sector reform in Liberia [Note 48], p. 4.

59 DynCorp International (2008), DynCorp International awarded police training work in Haiti and Liberia. Available at: <http://ir.dyn-intl.com>. Accessed on: 22 June 2008

60 Malan, Mark (2008), Security sector reform in Liberia: mixed results from humble beginnings. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College. Available at: <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil>. Accessed on: 09 May 2008.

61 Ebo, Adedeji (2007), “Liberia case study” [Note 48].

62 Bendix, Daniel and Stanley, Ruth (2008), “Deconstructing local ownership of security sector reform: A review of the literature”, African Security Review Vol. 17 N° 2, pp. 93-104., ISS: Pretoria. Accessed on: 1 September 2008.

63 OECD-DAC (2005) [Note 1].

64 Ebo (2007), “Liberia case study” [Note 48].

65 Ebo (2007), “Towards sustainable peace and security” [Note 47].

66 Ebo (2005) [Note 48], p. 55.

67 The authors of the security review have published on their work in the Africa Policy Journal: Gompert and Stearns (2006) [Note 48].

68 Jaye (2006) [Note 48], p. 13.

69 Aboagye and Rupiya (2005) [Note 48], p. 263.

70 Andersen (2006) [Note 48], pp. 4-5.

71 Ebo (2007), “Liberia case study” [Note 48].

72 Ebo, Adedeji (2007), “Towards sustainable peace and security in Africa” [Note 47]

73 Gbla, Osman (2007), Security sector reform in Sierra Leone [Note 47].

74 Ball, Nicole et al. (2007), Security and justice sector reform programmeming in Africa. London: DFID (Evaluation Working Paper 23). Available at: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>. Accessed on: 10 August 2007.

75 Anderlini, S.N./Conaway, C.P. (2004), Security sector reform, in International Alert/ Women Waging Peace (eds.), Inclusive security, sustainable peace: a toolkit for advocacy and action, pp. 31-40. Available at: <http://www.international-alert.org>. Accessed on: 19 July 2007.

76 Malan (2008) [Note 60], p. 52.

77 Ibid, p. 54.

78 Mehler and Smith-Höhn (2007) [Note 38], p. 56.

79 Vanessa Farr cited in UN INSTRAW 2004: Gender and security sector reform, summary of e-discussion, 4 October – 7 November , p. 7. Available at: <http://www.un-instraw.org>. Accessed on: 14 July 2007.

80 Brzoska (2003) [Note 2], p. 2.

81 Ebo (2007), The role of SSR in sustainable development [Note 14].

82 Hutchful and Fayemi (2005) [Note 16], p. 80.

83 Bendix and Stanley (2008) [Note 62].

84 Patrick, Stewart and Brown, Kaysie (2007), The Pentagon and global development: making sense of the DoD's expanding role, Washington, DC: Center for Global Development, Working Paper No. 131.

85 Ibid.

86 Minnaert, Anja and Stanley, Ruth (2007), "Reforma del sector seguridad en América latina y el Caribe", Cuadernos de Seguridad N° 5, Argentine Ministry of Justice, Security and Human Rights: Buenos Aires, pp. 121-155.

87 DCAF (2007), Africa Plenary Session: African Approaches to SSR, Geneva: DCAF. Available at: <http://www.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 15 March 2008.

Appendix

The data presented here was compiled on the basis of a search of open sources, mainly the websites of donor institutions. These institutions have very different reporting styles, and the data should be taken as indicative of general trends rather than representing a complete overview of SSR measures with external involvement. Data as of August 2008.

- Table 1: External support for SSR projects in Africa
- Table 2: States/regions with external support for SSR measures
- Table 3: Involvement of external actors in SSR according to states/regions

Table 1: External support for SSR projects in Africa

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
Belgium	MoD	DRC	Training and equipping of army
Canada	DFAIT/CIDA/Canada Fund for Africa	ECOWAS	Support to regional dialogues among militaries, police and civilian agencies to promote understanding of the challenges of SSR; training/ technical assistance in human rights, civilian oversight, democratic accountability, resouce management, legitimate role of armed forces in society, etc.
Denmark	Royal Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs/ Danida	Ghana	Security, Safety and Accessible Justice (SSAJ) project (initiated 2002): support to improve access to justice and public safety and to support the development of the Ghanaian-led justice sector reform programme
	n.d.	South Africa	Support for NGOs involved in SSR
European Union	EUPOL within ESDP	DRC	Police reform (since July 2007)
	EUSEC within ESDP	DRC	Reform of armed forces: advice and assistance to the Congolese authorities in charge of security while ensuring the promotion of policies that are compatible with human rights and international humanitarian law, democratic standards, principles of good public management, transparency and observance of the rule of law

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	EU mission in support of security sector reform in Guinea-Bissau within ESDP	Guinea-Bissau	Advice and assistance in support of SSR
France	MoD, Ministry of Interior, Ministry of Foreign Affairs	DRC	Training and equipping of 2000 Rapid Intervention Police; training of Integrated Police Unit; training of army
Germany	GTZ	Ghana	Support of the Kofi Annan International Peacekeeping Training Centre (KAIPTC) (since 2003)
	GTZ	Ghana	SSAJ (initiated 2002): support to improve access to justice and public safety and to support the development of the Ghanaian-led justice sector reform programme (JSRP)
	GTZ	Kenya	Peace Support Training Centre (PSTC) (2004-2006)
	GTZ	Mozambique	Community Policing (2002-2004): support of Ministry of Interior, workshops with civil society representatives and integration of concept into curricula of police schools
	GTZ	South Africa	Conflict management in urban poor areas: peace and development project in South Africa (since 2000); support of implementation of White Paper on Safety and Security of 1999 and Youth Policy through engagement of youth in community policing and mediation
	GTZ	Uganda	Workshops on domestic violence and police work (2003-2008)

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	GTZ	Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania	Community Peace and Security Team in refugee camps (since Oct. 2007): in cooperation with the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)
	GTZ	Southern Africa	Regional co-ordinator peace and security in Southern Africa (2004-2007): support in implementation of the Africa Peace and Security Agenda of the African Union (AU)
International Bank for Reconstruc-tion and Development (IBRD)		Ghana	SSAJ project (initiated 2002): support to improve access to justice and public safety and to support the development of the Ghanaian-led JSRP
Netherlands	Government	Uganda	Sector-wide Justice, Law and Order Reform Programme
Norway	Ministry of Foreign Affairs through the International Peace Research Institute (PRIO)	Malawi	Malawi Security Sector Reform Pilot Project: community policing, community safety and firearms control
South Africa	Department of Defence	Nigeria	Reform of the MoD
UK	DFID	Burundi	Capacity building for police; technical assistance for SSR cell

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	DFID et al. through *Restauration de la Justice à l'Est de la RDC* (REJUSCO)	DRC	Justice sector reform, rule of law
	Security Sector Development and Advisory Team (SSDAT) & DFID	Ethiopia	Support of SSR within MoD and Ministry of Federal Affairs: assistance for planning and implementing SSR
	n.d.	Ethiopia	Justice Sector Reform Programme (JSRP)
	SSDAT with DFID/ FCO/MoD	Ethiopia	Implementation of military pillar of SSR; defense transformation
	DFID	Ghana	SSAJ project (initiated 2002): support to improve access to justice and public safety and to support the development of the Ghanaian-led JSRP
	DFID	Ghana	Justice Sector Development Programme, rule of law, strengthening civil society
	ACPP	Ghana	support to police
	DAT	Ghana	Support of MoD in the adoption of a Performance Improvement Programme, which is to promote a more systematic, co-ordinated and transparent approach to defence reform (2002)
	ACPP through SSDAT	Guinea-Bissau	Fact finding mission

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	ACPP	Kenya	Reform of armed forces: military assistance to Kenya's armed forces in order to contribute to SSR and increase peacekeeping capacity
	DFID	Kenya	Legal Sector Reform Project
	DFID	Lesotho	Community Safety and Security Project; Justice Sector Development Programme (JSDP)
	n.d.	Liberia	Disbanding of police officers who have not met the basic standards of service
	DFID	Malawi	Malawi Safety, Security and Access to Justice Programme (MaSSAJ): logistical resources to institutions such as the police, judiciary, and prison department; co-ordination, and co-operation; mounting pilot initiatives and policy experiments. MALPOD (Malawi Police Organizational Development) Project
	MoD & DFID	Nigeria	Access to Justice Programme (now Security, Justice and Growth): reform of police (including informal policing systems), justice (including indigenous justice, alternative dispute resolution and lower courts), armed forces (professionalisation, training for Peace Support Operations [PSO])
	SSDAT	Nigeria	Reform of the MoD
	SSDAT & DFID	Rwanda	Security policy formulation, justice sector reform, police reform
	International Military and Training Team (IMATT) and DFID	Sierra Leone	Transformation of the military

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	DFID	Sierra Leone	JSDP
	MoD	Sierra Leone	Democratic civil-military relations; restructuring, training and capacity strengthening of national army
	Home Office	Sierra Leone	Funding for military education and training and reform of the national police service
	DFID	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone Anti-Corruption Commission Project
	DFID & MoD	Sierra Leone	Sierra Leone Security Sector Reform Programme (SILSEP): establish effective and disciplined armed forces, controlled and accountable to the government; intelligence reform; police reform
	DFID	Sierra Leone	Commonwealth Community Safety and Security Project (CCSSP): police reform
	SSDAT	Sudan	Assistance with reform/modernisation programme
	DFID	South Africa	SSAJ, especially policing
	DFID	Tanzania	early retirement scheme for the Tanzanian People's Defense Force
	ACCP through SSDAT	Uganda	Defense Review
	GCPP	Uganda	White Paper on Defense Review (ca 2003)
	ACCP	Zambia	Defense Diplomacy Scholarship Scheme

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	DFID through African Security Dialogue and Research (ASDR) and Centre for Democracy and Development (CDD)	ECOWAS region	ASSN: strengthening and promoting regional security and conflict prevention within the ECOWAS sub-region
	Through University of Witwatersrand	SADC region	SADSEM: capacity building through education and training for security sector governance
UN	MONUC CIVPOL	DRC	Police reform
	Justice and Security Sector Reform (JSSR) Team of UNDP's BCPR	Ghana	Supporting programmes promoting civilian control of military and security services; improving service delivery, public accountability and credibility, and improving the overall governance and operations of the police (especially in the area of human rights and community policing)
	JSSR Team of UNDP's BCPR	Kenya	Judicial reforms to enhance access to justice and promote capacity building for legal staff
	UNMIL	Liberia	Restructuring of police, Immigration Force, Special Security Services (SSS), custom security guards and other statutory security units (excluding the armed forces), penal system reform
	UNDP	Mozambique	Police Reform Programme (initiated in 1998)
	UNDP	Rwanda	Capacity building of police
	UNDP, UNAMSIL	Sierra Leone	JSDP

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	CIVPOL	Sierra Leone	Police mentoring and monitoring
	UNDP	Somalia	Rule of law and security: support of Somaliland SSR; planning process for Somali Police Force
	UNDP	Tanzania	Professionalisation of armed forces
US	International Military Education and Training (IMET)	Burkina Faso	Civilian control of the military, respect for human rights, the role of the military in a democracy and military justice
	DoJ	Ghana	Institutional law enforcement development assistance; community policing
	IMET	Ghana	Support for programmes promoting civilian control of military and security services
	US Government through DynCorp and PAE	Liberia	Transformation of the armed forces (and demobilisation)
	DoD through RAND Corporation	Liberia	RAND Report Making Liberia Safe: Transformation of the National Security Sector
	USAID	Malawi	Programme seeking to increase access to justice for the mainly rural and largely illiterate population by supporting the expansion of rural paralegal services
	IMET	Mali	Army professionalisation and education in human rights/civilian control of armed forces

Donors	Donor agency	Recipient country	Project and/or focus
	IMET	Mozambique	Training of armed forces, which emphasises the necessity of an apolitical, professional, civilian-controlled military
	IMET	Namibia	Training of armed forces in democratic values and respect for civilian institutions
	DoJ	Nigeria	Police reform, community policing
	IMET	Rwanda	Professionalisation of the military, with courses on respect for human rights and civilian control of the military, military justice, and improved civil-military relations
	USAID	Sierra Leone	JSDP
	USAID	South Africa	Penal reform
	IMET	Tanzania	Support for professionalisation of armed forces and for improvement of civil-military relations.
	USAID	Uganda	Peace building and reconciliation activities, including special attention to economic growth and access to justice
	IMET	Uganda	Training of armed forces in human rights, officer professionalism, peacekeeping and civil-military relations

Table 2: States/regions with external support for SSR measures

Country/region	Donor country/institution
Burkina Faso	US
Burundi	UK
DRC	Belgium, EU, France, UK, UN
Ethiopia	UK
Ghana	Denmark, Germany, IBRD, UK, UN, US
Guinea-Bissau	EU, UK
Kenya	Germany, UK, UN,
Lesotho	UK
Liberia	UK, UN, US
Malawi	Norway, UK, US
Mali	US
Mozambique	Germany, UN, US
Nigeria	South Africa, UK, US
Rwanda	UK, UN; US
Sierra Leone	UK, UN, US
Somalia	UN
South Africa	Denmark, Germany, UK, US
Sudan	UK
Tanzania	Germany, UK, UN, US
Uganda	Germany, Netherlands, UK, US
Zambia	UK
ECOWAS/West Africa	Canada, UK
SADC/Southern Africa	Germany, UK

Table 3: Involvement of external actors in SSR according to states/regions

Donor	Recipient country/region
Belgium	DRC
Canada	ECOWAS
Denmark	Ghana, South Africa
EU	DRC, Guinea-Bissau
France	DRC
Germany	Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda, Southern Africa
IBRD	Ghana
Netherlands	Uganda
Norway	Malawi
South Africa	Nigeria
UK	Burundi, DRC, Ethiopia, Ghana, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda, Zambia, ECOWAS region, SADC region
UN	Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, Tanzania
US	Burkina Faso, Ghana, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia, Nigeria, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Africa, Tanzania, Uganda

Bibliography

Aboagye, Festus and Rupiya, Martin (2005), "Enhancing post-conflict democratic governance through effective security sector reform in Liberia", in F. Aboagye and A. Bah, eds., *A tortuous road to peace. The dynamics of regional, UN and international humanitarian interventions in Liberia*, Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies. Available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 12 June 2007.

Abrahamsen, Rita and Williams, Michael (2006), "Security sector reform. Bringing the private in", *Conflict, Security & Development,* 6/1, pp. 1-23.

Anderlini, Sanam Naraghi and Conaway, Camille Pampell (2004), "Security Sector Reform", in International Alert/Women Waging Peace, eds., Inclusive security, sustainable peace: a toolkit for advocacy and action, pp. 31-40. Available at: <http://www.international-alert.org>. Accessed on: 19 July 2007.

Andersen, Louise (2006), Post-conflict security sector reform and the challenge of ownership – the case of Liberia. DIIS Brief, July. Available at: <http://www.diis.dk>. Accessed on: 26 November 2007.

Ball, Nicole (2001), "Transforming security sectors: the IMF and World Bank approaches", *Journal of Conflict, Security and Development*, 1/1, pp. 45-66.

Ball, Nicole et al. (2007), Security and justice sector reform programmeming in Africa. London: DFID (Evaluation Working Paper 23). Available at: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>. Accesssed on: 10 August 2007.

Baker, Bruce (2006), "The African post-conflict policing agenda in Sierra Leone", *Conflict, Security & Development*, 6/1, pp. 25-49.

Baker, Bruce and Scheye, Eric (2007), Supporting state and non-state provision of security and justice, Lunchtime seminar DFID, London. Available at: <http://www.ssrnetwork.net>. Accessed on: 7 May 2008.

Bendix, Daniel and Stanley, Ruth (2008), "Deconstructing local ownership of security sector reform: A review of the literature", African Security Review. Vol. 17 N° 2, pp. 93-104.Available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 1 September 2008

Bonn International Center for Conversion (BICC) (2005), Inventory of security sector reform (SSR) efforts in developing and transitional countries. Available at: <http://www.bicc.de>. Accessed on: 3 August 2007.

BICC (2005), Security sector reform in Ghana. Available at: <http://www.bicc.de>. Accessed on: 29 January 2008.

BICC (2005), Security sector reform in Kenya. Available at: <http://www.bicc.de>. Accessed on: 29 January 2008.

Bundesministerium fuer Wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (BMZ) (2006), Interministerielles Rahmenkonzept zur Unterstützung von Reformen des Sicherheitssektors in Entwicklungs- und Transformationsländern. Available at: <http://www.bmz.de>. Accessed on: 7 May 2008.

Boas, Morten (2001), "Liberia and Sierra Leone - dead ringers? The logic of neopatrimonial rule", *Third World Quarterly,* 22/5, pp. 697-723.

Brzoska, Michael (2003), Development donors and the concept of security sector reform. DCAF Occasional Paper, 4. Geneva: DCAF. Available at: <http://www.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 20 June 2007.

Bryden, Alan, N'Diaye, Boubacar and Olonisakin, 'Funmi (2005), Security sector governance in West Africa: turning principles to practice. DCAF Policy Paper, 8. Available at <http://www.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 20 June 2007.

Chataigner, Jean-Marc (2006), "La réforme du secteur de sécurité dans les États et sociétés fragiles. Préalable indispensable au développement, ou dernière des illusions néocoloniales?", *Afrique Contemporaine,* 2/218, pp. 101-117.

Clingendael (2008), Towards a whole-of-government approach to security system reform, Conference background paper, The Hague 9-10 April 2008. Available at: <http://www.clingendael.nl>. Accessed on: 28 May 2008.

Conteh, Kellie (2007), "Sierra Leone case study – local ownership of the security sector review and transformation processes", in Nathan, L., ed., *No ownership, no commitment. A guide to local ownership of security sector reform,* Birmingham: University of Birmingham, pp. 86-93.

DCAF. (2007), Africa plenary pession: African approaches to SSR. Geneva: DCAF. Available at: <http://www.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 15 March 2008.

DFID (1999), Poverty and the security sector. Policy statement. London: DFID.

DFID (2000), Security sector reform: Review of the role of external actors. Discussion paper 2. London: DFID.

DFID (2002), Understanding and supporting security sector reform. London: DFID.

DFID (2004), The Africa Conflict Prevention Pool – A joint UK Government approach to preventing and reducing conflict in Sub-Saharan Africa. Available at: <http://www.dfid.gov.uk>. Accessed on: 15 October 2007.

DFID / MoD / Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO (n.d.), Security sector reform strategy. Available at: <http://www.gsdrc.org>. Accessed on: 27 May 2008.

Ebo, Adedeji (2005), The challenges and opportunities of security sector reform in post-conflict Liberia. DCAF Occasional Paper, 5. Available at: <http://www.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 26 November 2007.

Ebo, Adedeji (2007), "The role of SSR in sustainable development: donor policy trends and challenges", *Conflict, Security & Development*, 7/1, pp. 27–60.

Ebo, Adedeji (2007), "Liberia case study: outsourcing SSR to foreign companies", in L. Nathan, ed., *No ownership, no commitment. A guide to local ownership of security sector reform.* Birmingham: University of Birmingham. Available at: <http://www.ssrnetwork.net>. Accessed on: 13 November 2007.

Ebo, Adedeji (2007), "Toward sustainable peace and security in Africa. The challenges of security sector reform in post-conflict Sierra Leone", in Aboagye, F., ed., *Complex emergencies in the 21st century. Challenges of new Africa's strategic peace and security policy issues*, Pretoria: ISS, pp. 49-71. Available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 10 January 2008.

Ebo, Adedeji (2007), Towards a common ECOWAS agenda on security sector reform, DCAF Policy Paper 23, Geneva.

Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2004), "Governing insecurity in post-conflict states: the case of Sierra Leone and Liberia", in A. Bryden and H. Hänggi, eds., *Reform and Reconstruction of the Security Sector,* Münster: LIT, pp. 179-205.

Gbla, Osman (2006), "Security sector reform under international tutelage in Sierra Leone", *International Peacekeeping*, 13/1, pp. 78-93.

Gbla, Osman (2007), "Security sector reform in Sierra Leone", in L. le Roux, and Y. Kidane, eds., *Challenges to security sector reform in the Horn of Africa,* Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies, pp. 13-36 (ISS Monograph Series 135). Available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 14 August 2007.

Ginifer, Jeremy (2004), Evaluation of the conflict prevention pools - Sierra Leone, Evaluation Report EV 647. Available at: <http://ww.dfid.gov.uk>. Accessed on: 20 January 2008.

Ginifer, Jeremy (2006), "The challenge of the security sector and security reform processes in democratic transitions: the case of Sierra Leone", *Democratization,* 13/5, pp. 791 – 810.

Gompert, David C. and Stearns, Brooke (2006), "Comprehensive security-sector reform: making Liberia safe", *Africa Policy Journal,* Fall/2, pp. 1-27.

Hendricks, Cheryl (2008), "Die Weiterentwicklung der Agenda der menschlichen Sicherheit. Afrikanische Perspektiven", in C. Ulbert and S. Werthes, eds., *Menschliche Sicherheit. Globale Herausforderungen und regionale Perspektiven.* Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 137-148.

Hutchful, Eboe and Fayemi, J. 'Kayode (2005), "Security system reform in Africa", in OECD-DAC, ed., *Security system reform and governance.* DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Paris: OECD, pp. 71-90.

IANSA / Oxfam International / Saferworld (2007), Africa's missing billions. International arms flow and the cost of conflict, Oxfam Briefing Paper 107. Available at: <http://oxfam.intelli-direct.com>. Accessed on: 6 January 2008.

International Crisis Group (ICG) (2006), Liberia – Staying focused, Africa Briefing 36. Available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org>. Accessed on: 22 January 2008.

ICG (2006), Security sector reform in the Congo. Africa Report 104, 13 February 2006. Available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org>. Accessed on: 23 May 2007.

ICG (2007), Sierra Leone – the election opportunity, Africa Report 129, 12 July 2007. Available at: <http://www.crisisgroup.org>. Accessed on 22 January 2008.

Isima, Jeffrey (2007), 'Regulating the private security sector – an imperative for security sector governance in Africa', *Journal of Security Sector Management*, 5/1. Available at: <http://www.ssronline.org>. Accessed on: 17 January 2008.

Jaye, Thomas (2006), An assessment report on security sector reform in Liberia. KAIPTC Report, 3, 23 September 2006. Available at: <http://www.kaiptc.org>. Accessed on: 26 November 2007.

Koerner, Wolfgang (2006), Réforme du secteur de la sécurité: la diplomatie de la défense, Service d'information et de recherche parlementaires. Available at: <http://www.parl.gc.ca>. Accessed on: 20 May 2007.

Lalá, Anícia (2004), 'Picturing the landscape: police, justice, penal and intelligence reforms in Africa', in C. Ferguson and J.O. Isima, eds., *Providing security for people – enhancing security through police, justice, and intelligence reform in Africa,* Shrivenham: GFN-SSR, pp. 3-18.

Legwaila, Joseph Legwaila. 2003), "Security sector reform in Africa: relevance to peace building", in UNOG-DCAF, eds., *Security sector reform: its relevance for conflict prevention, peace building, and development*, Geneva: DCAF, pp. 34-38. Available at: <http://se2.dcaf.ch>. Accessed on: 15 January 2008.

Malan, Mark (2008), Security sector reform in Liberia: mixed results from humble beginnings. Carlisle, PA: Strategic Studies Institute, US Army War College. Available at: <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil>. Accessed on: 09 May 2008.

Manning, Nick and Knack, Steve (2000), Notes on the issues in using military spending as an indicator of the quality of governance, World Bank. Available at: <http://www1.worldbank.org>. Accessed on: 28 May 2007.

Minnaert, Anja and Stanley, Ruth (2007), "Reforma del sector seguridad en América latina y el Caribe", Cuadernos de Seguridad N° 5, Ministry of Justice, Security and Human Rights, Argentina: Buenos Aires, pp. 121-155.

Multi-Country Demobilisation and Reintegration Programme (2003), Linkages between disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants and security sector reform. Position paper. Available at <http://www.mdrp.org>. Accessed 17 October 2007.

Mehler, Andreas and Smith-Höhn, Judy (2007), "Security actors in Liberia and Sierra Leone – roles, interactions and perceptions", in T. Debiel and D. Lambach, eds., *State failure revisited II: actors of violence and alternative forms of governance*, Duisburg: INEF (INEF Report 89), pp. 50-66.

Musah, Abdel-Fatau, (2000), "A country under siege: state decay and corporate military intervention in Sierra Leone", in A.F. Musah and J.F. Fayemi, eds., *Mercenaries – an African security dilemma*, London: Pluto Press, pp. 76-116.

Neretniks, Karlis and Kaljurand, Riina (2007), Security Sector Reform: A Nordic – Baltic agenda. Available at: <http://www2.foi.se>. Accessed on: 22 June 2008.

OECD-DAC (2005), Security system reform and governance, DAC Guidelines and Reference Series, Paris: OECD.

OECD-DAC (2007), OECD-DAC handbook on security system reform, Paris: OECD.

OECD (2005), Paris declaration on aid effectiveness. Ownership, harmonisation, alignment, results and mutual accountability. Paris: OECD.

Omotola, J. Shola (2006), "Post-election reconstruction in Liberia: the challenges of security sector reform", Conflict Trends Issue 2, ACCORD: Durban, pp. 42-46.

Patrick, Stewart and Brown, Kaysie (2007), The Pentagon and global development: making sense of the DoD's expanding role, Washington, DC: Center for Global Development, Working Paper No. 131.

Petri, Jack (2002), The role of private military companies in security sector reform. Available at: <http://www.isn.ethz.ch>. Accessed on: 6 January 2007.

Richards, Anna and Smith, Henry (2007), Addressing the role of private security companies within security sector reform programmes, London: International Alert. Available at: <http://www.saferworld.org.uk>. Accessed on: 15 January 2008.

Sebahara, Pamphile (2006), La réforme du secteur de la securité en RD Congo, Note d'Analyse, GRIP-Friedrich Ebert Stiftung. Available at: <http://www.grip.org>. Accessed on: 17 May 2007.

Tjønneland, E. (2003), Norway and security sector reform in developing countries, in: CMI Report 12. Available at: <http://www.cmi.no>. Accessed on: 22 January 2008.

Ukeje, Charles (2005), Rethinking Africa's security in the age of uncertain globalisation – NEPAD and human security in the 21st century, paper submitted to the 11th CODESRIA General Assembly, Maputo, Mozambique, 6-10 December. Available at: <http://www.codesria.org>. Accessed on: 31 January 2008.

UNDP (2003), Security sector reform and transitional justice. A crisis post-conflict programmematic approach. Available at: <http://www.undp.org>. Accessed on: 28 May 2007.

UN International Research and Training Institute for the Advancement of Women (INSTRAW) (2004), Gender and security sector reform, summary of e-discussion, 4 October – 7 November. Available at: <http://www.un-instraw.org>. Accessed on: 14 July 2007.

UN Security Council (2007), Security sector reform in post-conflict states critical to consolidating peace. SC/8958, 20 February 2007. Available at: <http://www.un.org>. Accessed on: 28 May 2007.

Vitalis, Joseph (2004), "La réforme du secteur de sécurité en Afrique", *Afrique Contemporaine*, 1/209, pp. 65-79. Available at: <http://www.cairn.info>. Accessed on: 08 January 2008.

Williams, Ishola (2007), "The challenges of security sector reform in West Africa", in L. le Roux and Y. Kidane, eds., *Challenges to security sector reform in the Horn of Africa*, Pretoria: ISS, pp. 37-50.

Williams, Rocklyn (2000), "Africa and the challenges of security sector reform", in J. Cilliers and A. Hilding-Norberg, eds., *Building stability in Africa: challenges for the new millennium,* Pretoria: Institute for Security Studies (Monograph No. 46). Available at: <http://www.iss.co.za>. Accessed on: 14 May 2007.

World Bank (1999), Security, poverty reduction and sustainable development. Challenges for the new millennium. Washington DC: World Bank.

Wulf, Herbert (2004), "Security sector reform in developing and transitional countries", in C. McCarthy, M. Fischer, O. Wils, eds., *Security sector reform. Potentials and challenges for conflict transformation*. Berlin: Berghof Institute, (Berghof Handbook for Conflict Transformation and Dialogue Series No. 2), pp. 9-27.