

Leadership in UN Peacekeeping Operations

HPC Textbook

Date of Lecture/Workshop: January 2016

Session Number of Lecture/Workshop: 3

Theme: Leadership and Management Competencies in Peace Operations

Topic: Leadership in UN Peacekeeping Operations

Lecturer/Facilitator: Major General (Retired) Robert Gordon

Brief Summary of Lecture

This paper is written to act as a companion piece to the Power Point presentation (PPT) given to the course on Tuesday 12 January 2016 by Major General (Retired) Robert Gordon. While it is a self-standing paper the slides that are relevant to the argument are indicated in brackets, so that it can also be used to help navigate and amplify the headings in the presentation, if necessary or desired.

The paper tries to isolate what is meant by leadership and its different types, styles and characteristics and then apply these to the UN context. Its premise is that leadership is a process of influence and can be learned despite an individual's personal temperament. However, leadership in the UN, because of its complexity, requires additional skill sets to leadership in a purely national context. The demanding context and the competencies of UN leadership are discussed with observations on what good leadership in the UN should look like and how it can be achieved.

Contents of Lecture/Workshop

Introduction.

It is often said that even when a Mission's mandate is clear and well prioritized by a united Security Council, and even where the needed resources and capabilities match the environment, unless there is good leadership the Mission is unlikely to succeed. This simple statement puts an emphasis on leadership and places good leadership where it should belong, at the forefront of mission requirements. It is therefore important to try to analyze good mission leadership and try to see what if anything is different about it, from leadership in any other organization. It was observed by a recent Under-Secretary-General that the UN still tended to throw its leaders into the deep end of the pool without really knowing whether they could swim or not. This both recognizes the difficulties of 'swimming' in contemporary missions and the risks inherent in the selection and deployment of leaders from Member States. To meet its objectives of fairness, universality and legitimacy the UN must recruit its leaders (political, developmental, and security) from the spectrum of its contributing member states. Some leaders are a known quantity and have learned their trade on earlier missions. Many are new to the UN, and while being recommended as leaders by their own member states, they have not necessarily conceptualized or experienced the step change in complexity between leadership

in a national context and leadership within UN peacekeeping. This recognizes that there is something extra needed in UN leadership. To find out what this is we first need to understand what is meant by the term “leadership”.

What is Leadership?

If we search the word leadership in any Internet search engine, we will get thousands of hits. This acknowledges the importance of leadership to all organizations, particularly the private sector. To get closer to its meaning it is helpful to think of important leaders in our own lives, people we have admired and for whom it is a privilege to work. It is sometimes easier to think about them in this way before trying to define leadership. What was it, or is it, about them that make them such a good role model for us? (Slide 3).

Different cultures admire different attributes about leadership, but having conducted this simple exercise all over the world, we do get a core of attributes that the majority of us, from whatever culture, recognize as key characteristics of good leadership. In any multi-cultural group of people (which describes the UN) the majority votes tend to include: providing vision or direction; being an empathetic and good listener; being an inclusive team builder; showing humility; having good delegation, decision making, and communication skills and above all showing integrity. It would be fair to conclude that a person who combines all or most of these attributes is getting close to being the kind of leader whom most of us can admire and follow.

If this helps us understand what makes good leadership, it is now worth dwelling for a moment on what leadership actually is. (Slides 4 and 5). Again, there are many different views, but most thinking on this subject believes it is *the art of influencing others to achieve the leader’s desired outcomes*. It is art because it depends upon human creative skill and because it is about the interface between humans. It is organic. It involves getting others to do what you want them to do. But it is worth noting that not all good leaders are good people, (there are many examples throughout history where people have been malignly influenced by effective leaders to serve evil or bad outcomes.) So when we talk about good leadership we must always talk about leadership with integrity; the “desired outcomes” must be for some common good. We should also note that being in a position of leadership does not automatically make a person a leader. Sadly, UN operations are littered with examples of people who are in positions of leadership but who show few of the characteristics of good leadership. This tells us that leadership is a process of influence; not a position. This introduces another important element, which is that the corollary to leadership is “followership”, and followership does not come automatically, it has to be earned. Followership is voluntary. Leaders have to earn the respect and acceptance of their teams and subordinates. To do this they have to show the characteristics which we as individuals and followers admire.

Styles of Leadership (Slide 6)

If we accept that leadership is an art, we must accept that we as individuals can control and adapt this art. It is often stated that leaders are born and not made, but while some people may find some of the characteristics of leadership easier to display than others, it does not mean that leadership cannot be learned. This is based on the premise that we are given (born with) our different personalities but we can learn to adapt our behaviour. This is an important concept, for it gives everyone a chance of self-development. But it

assumes we know our own personality and that most professional people of mid-rank will have been tested (Briggs Meyers etc) and mentored on how this personality comes across to others. We are all different and while some seem to assume the mantle of leadership naturally, others have to work at it. But if we are to be leaders we all have to generate followship; It is therefore useful to know what people look for in their leaders, and then try to adapt our behaviour to meet these requirements, while remaining true to ourselves. This does not mean that good leadership is artificial or contrived, but it does mean that we all must recognize that when we are in a position of leadership we are on a form of stage. People are looking at us or up to us; and if we are to gain their attention and influence them we must, like any good actor, rise to the occasion, gather together our wits and our breath and communicate. So self-awareness is an important attribute of leadership.

In order to understand the challenge of good leadership it is useful to analyze different leadership styles. Good leadership is knowing when and where to use which style. None of the styles examined take away the responsibility of the leader to be accountable for the decisions made. This points to another truth about leadership which is its relationship to decision making. It is hard to be a leader if you are unprepared to make decisions and be accountable for them.

- Authoritative Leadership. This style is common amongst hierarchical organizations characterised by overt (and often uniformed) rank structures, such as the police or the military. It is a style needed for crises, when time is of the essence, and often the very safety of the team or group is under threat. The leader is expected to make the fast decision and the team/subordinates are expected to obey it. There is no time for discussion or persuasion, just action. We are all familiar with this style, and often in time of crisis it is welcomed. But overuse brings its drawbacks. For a start only one brain is assessing the situation. It may be (and hopefully is) a good and trained brain but there may be better options which that brain has not grasped but which others have. If therefore this style is used to the exclusion of others, there is a danger of the wrong decision being made, and worse, in time if persisted in as a style, it leads to the disempowerment and disengagement of the subordinates or team. When an authoritative style starts to become autocratic, it begins to lose its followship.
- Mission or Directive Leadership. This style is often regarded by organizations as the best style of leadership. It involves the leader stating his/her intent and desired outcome and then letting the subordinate/team find their way to that outcome. It says *what* is to be achieved, not *how*. It is efficient in that it allows the leader to concentrate on other things once direction is given. It empowers teams and subordinates. It avoids micro-management. It focuses on the product not the process. It can involve periodic reviews and controls but it carries risk. It requires excellent understanding and communication between the leader and the subordinate/team. They must be in each others' mind and trusted. This requires a good knowledge of each other and preferably the subordinate/team has been trained by the leader. All these requirements are seldom met in ad hoc UN missions characterised by multi-

cultural, multi-lingual, multi-disciplinary structures. And so while recognized as a desirable style of leadership, it takes time and much joint experience before it can be safely adopted within the turbulent environment of UN peace operations.

- Participative or Collaborative Leadership. The tendency within the UN is therefore to default to this style of leadership, which involves group discussion before decision. It harnesses the abilities and brains of the team, without removing the responsibility of the leader to decide and be accountable. Teams feel consulted and therefore empowered. But it can take time, especially when the team are not good or practiced in sharing their views positively and succinctly. The leader therefore needs to show patience and be good at listening, while remaining faithful to the needed time line. It can be used in emergencies and crises to get wider views but at some time in this situation the leader will have to be decisive.

Good leadership tend to mix these styles depending on the situation, to know when to consult, to delegate, to listen and to be decisive. Depending on our personality type, some styles are easier to adopt than others. Types who are naturally authoritative (and extrovert) need to know how and when to consult, to listen and to show empathy. Conversely, natural consensus seekers (introverts) need to know how and when to be decisive and to take personal risk. Understanding these styles helps adapt our behaviour to improve our leadership. Nevertheless, different types thrive in different situations. Ideally (but rarely) leaders are chosen for their type to match the requirement. In the world of UN peace operations at the start up of a mission it is helpful to have a leader who can thrive in chaos and uncertainty, and who can make fast decisions. Conversely, in times of transition to the host nation when diplomatic and state building skills are needed, it is good to have leaders who are naturally collaborative and consensual.

It is of course axiomatic that leadership is as old as mankind and accordingly there has been much philosophy from Confucius to the present day on the tenets of good leadership. But I have been struck by what Aristotle had to say in the 4th Century BCE to his student Alexander the Great of Macedon. (Slide 7) . (This was first described to me by Prof John Antonakis of Lausanne University.) Alexander had set off to conquer the know Eastern world with a multi-national army. Aristotle said to him: “if you are to appeal (influence) to your followers you need to use three things: *pathos*, *ethos* and *logos*.” In western language these Greek words form the basis of words respectively meaning empathy, ethics (integrity) and logic/knowledge/competence. Aristotle went on to say that without them you must rely on “contracts or torture”. We have all probably known leaders who only get people to do what they want because they have power, contractual or disciplinary, over their subordinates. But Aristotle’s point was that you cannot conquer the world by managing your subordinates like that. Because true followship is voluntary, contracted subordinates will not follow you when the going gets tough. So use pathos, ethos and logos. This remains strikingly true today.

Modern Leadership Theory

In modern theories of leadership the simple words of Aristotle have been adapted to explain leadership styles. Theories now talk about transactional, instrumental and transformational leadership, and the need to blend the three. (Slide 8). Transactional leadership is the use of hard power, the leadership where authority is derived from the structure of the organization. This is often termed as detailing the *what* to do. Instrumental leadership is about professionalism and knowledge, knowing the business and its detail. The *how* to do things. While transformational leadership is about charismatically creating and inspiring the vision, the *why* of thinking and planning. Within a UN mission there needs to be a mixture of these styles. Inevitably given the authority and responsibility of the senior leaders, many of the relationships within the mission will be transactional. But such a style will only work where there is clear authority. Many of the key players within a mission context (such as the UN Country Team and the Donors) are outside such authority and so the leadership of them has to be a mix of instrumental and transformational. It is worth noting that transformational leadership on its own without a solid backing of instrumental leadership can be *misleading*. It is an empty shell. In Aristotelian terms, there must be logos as well as pathos, lest people are led in the wrong direction. Nevertheless, experience has shown that good inspirational leaders tend to be transformational in style and usually start at the *why* of thinking, planning and direction. This recognizes that if a leader can create a shared vision for the future amongst the team or subordinates, this will directly affect their behaviour in the present. It is for this reason that so often when the characteristics of good leaders are subjectively listed, terms such as “the ability to create a vision” are usually included; the transformational ability to make sense of confusion and to chart a path in which subordinates have faith.

Direct and Indirect Leadership (Slides 10 and 11)

We have discussed leadership styles but the *function* of leadership can also be split into Direct and Indirect Leadership. It is helpful to understand the difference as individuals gain more seniority and responsibility and their leadership challenges become more complex. Direct leadership, which might be called “heroic” leadership is essentially charismatic. It is that quality of personal magnetism and commitment which makes people follow the leader. It is the leadership that creates myths, songs and legends of old and creates team spirit today. It can be characterised as “follow me”. It is motivating and inspiring and it is applicable when leading small groups or teams. To work, this leadership has to be face to face, the charisma has to be felt and touched. The leader/follower relationship is direct. There is little need for complex coordination. It is therefore a requirement of junior leadership, but its core and techniques, while learned at a junior level, are absolutely applicable at middle and senior ranks.

However, there is a natural limit to when direct leadership alone can be applied. When organizations and structures become bigger and more complex, when the leader simply cannot “touch” everyone of his/her subordinates, there is an increasing requirement for indirect leadership. This is sometimes called organisational leadership. As the name implies it is the leadership needed for large organizations. It is about creating and managing coordinating structures and communication mechanisms, to achieve influence and to cascade the leaders’ intent down throughout the system. Typically it is displayed by leaders of large private sector corporations, or public sector organisations such as government departments, police forces or large military units. It does require leadership teams, who need to be trained and to be in the mind of the leader. It

therefore does still require direct leadership at the top level to influence the team. So, even in indirect leadership, there remains a need for the good leader to be transformational in style, because, if the leadership team does not share the vision, it is unlikely that anyone else below in the organisation will either.

The senior leadership of a large UN mission fits exactly into the category of an organisation that needs indirect leadership skills coupled with direct leadership expertise. Put simply, a Head of Mission and his/her mission leadership team, have to have the skill set to lead and manage and influence a \$1billion + mission with up to 20,000 staff in an exceptionally demanding environment. At the same time though, the senior leader in the field will need to use direct leadership when dealing and interacting personally with the many components in the mission area as well as with the elements of the leadership team.

The Environment for UN Leadership

Now that we have a clearer understanding of the concept and styles of leadership it is worth looking at the context for UN leadership, to understand the unique nature of its challenges. The pressure and demands on UN peacekeeping are unrelenting as it continues to be the Security Council's chosen instrument for dealing with conflict and the breakdown of international peace and security. At the same time the impact of the global financial crisis, has put a resource pressure on peacekeeping like never before. The principal financing member states (the FCCs) for UN peacekeeping are those most affected by the financial crisis, which has imposed constraints upon all public spending. Peacekeeping is not an exception to this. The UN is now required to do more with less. Efficiency, cost effectiveness and rigor in driving down costs are all now essential requirements for mission leadership. This is unfamiliar territory for many of them.

At the same time the consensus for peacekeeping looks uncertain. At the level of grand strategy, the partnership between the finance contributing countries and troop contributing countries remains fragile despite the recent stronger focus on quality rather than quantity. In this atmosphere, initiatives to drive a more robust and capable peacekeeping posture are constrained. Political divisions within the Security Council over Syria and Libya have compounded these difficulties. Meanwhile, at the operational level, it is evident in a number of missions that the host nation's consent for the presence of the peacekeeping mission is eroding. Mission leadership has to deal with this issue and the required transition to something other than peacekeeping. But there is little appetite amongst donors to write blank cheques for development without measurable progress in governance and the rule of law, and so difficult decisions have to be made at the operational level in an area where the UN still lacks expertise and capacity.

Most taxingly, and in addition to these significant pressures on mission leadership, it is arguable that the very paradigm of conflict is changing and that the UN's peace and security apparatus has yet to catch up. Just as the nature of conflict, which involved the UN, changed in the 1990s from inter-state to intra-state conflict (requiring a major conceptual and operational re-think of peacekeeping leading to multi-dimensional peacekeeping) so there is evidence that it is changing again. Much of present day conflict, in areas where international peace operations are deployed, is driven by criminal and extremist activity. From Afghanistan to Somalia, through Syria, Libya, the Sahel, Darfur and South Sudan, to parts of West Africa, and Haiti, the

driver for conflict and instability is most often trans national criminal and/or extremist violence. This violence and conflict thrives in an environment where there are weak institutions, poor governance and the absence of the rule of law. Peacekeepers today are not just caught up in the cross fire of conflict but actually sit in the cross hairs of those willing and keen to target them. They are attacked for what they are and not just for where they are, or for what they do. The result is that approximately two thirds of UN personnel are now operating in contexts of significant levels of ongoing violence. UN peacekeeping is struggling to manage this new paradigm of violence with conceptual and physical mechanisms still trying to make the change from traditional to multi- dimensional peacekeeping. The pressure and demands on UN leadership is therefore relentless and demanding. The environment is unusually complex, uncertain and it is influenced by many actors, internal and external. It is probably one of the most challenging environments for any organization to work within. Given that the UN Mission is, by its very nature, ad hoc and temporary, it is this environment that represents the major reason why leadership in UN missions requires additional skill sets compared to leadership in a purely national context.

Strategic Leadership in the UN

The concept of *strategic leadership* was developed by the US Army war college (USAWC). (Slide 14). It is important to note that it is using the term strategic not in the sense of levels of command and authority (as in “the UN’s strategic level of command resides in New York”), but in the sense of meaning the highest and most demanding challenge of leadership. As such it is very applicable to the leadership required in UN operations. The USAWC definition of strategic leadership is “*the process used by a senior leader to affect the achievement of a desired and clearly understood vision by influencing the organisational culture, allocating resources, directing through policy and directive and building consensus within a volatile, uncertain, complex and ambiguous environment, which is marked by opportunities and threats*”. It can be seen that this definition very accurately describes the UN operating environment: one that is volatile, because there is conflict, there is often literally blood in the soil; uncertain because of the internal and external complexities with no clear direction or solution (if there were, the problem would have been solved earlier, without the UN); complex because of the intricate network of staff, functions and components within a multi-dimensional, multi-cultural and multi-national mission; and ambiguous because of the multiplicity of mandated tasks which are often in tension. This describes a typically difficult “foggy” environment through which only good leadership can provide the necessary guidance and direction. Metaphors of leadership providing a compass or a light through this fog are often helpful.

The UN’s Mission Leadership Team

Given the complexity of the demands upon leadership in UN missions it has become best practice to help share the burden of leadership through the integrated operation of the mission leadership team (MLT). (Slide 14). The composition of the MLT will vary according to the size and focus of the mission, but all new large missions (in South Sudan, Mali, Central African Republic, DRC etc) always have a core component, chaired by the Head of Mission (or SRSG) which consists of the D/SRSG Political, the D/SRSG (Resident Coordinator/Humanitarian Coordinator), the Force Commander, the Police Commissioner, the Director of Mission Support and the Mission Chief of Staff. This team provides the “cabinet government” of the

mission, which works at the operational level and is responsible implementing the mission's mandate through the coordinated planning and execution of the many tasks. The effectiveness of the mission is often directly related to the team work this group show in working together to provide the vision and direction to shape and represent the culture of the mission, as well as the individual leadership they show in the direction of their respective components.

Personal Competencies for UN Leadership

From this analysis it is possible to determine the personal competencies that are needed to be an effective leader within the UN. (Slide 18) These competencies apply to not just to the senior leadership team but to all those who make up their followship but who have also have a responsibility at their level to show leadership. Certainly those in peace operations at their Mid-Career point are in this category.

- Be able to operate in a complex multi-cultural, multi-national environment. This takes inter-cultural competency, which comes from listening in order to understand, as well as the suspension of prejudicial judgement.
- Be a conceptual thinker, who is able to anticipate issues, can plan ahead, and can manage change in a dynamic, uncertain environment. Those who like an ordered, predictable life will never be comfortable in the UN.
- Have a good professional knowledge, the instrumental function of good leadership (or the *logos* of Aristotle). This takes study, hard work and personal application.
- Have the ability to build and influence teams and to earn their trust through empathy, humility and charisma (the *pathos* of Aristotle).
- Be a good communicator. It is hard to show transformational leadership if the vision and the *why* cannot be expressed. For some, this does not happen naturally, but it can be learned. There are easily mastered oratorical techniques, such as the use of metaphor, of stories, of groups of three, of repetition, of contrast, of rhetorical questions etc which can be practised and which can transform an individual's signalling and their ability to communicate convincingly.
- Finally, show integrity, the *ethos* of Aristotle. People watch leaders. They are looking for leaders whom they can respect and trust. All too often people who have responsibility for good leadership undermine their credibility by showing a lack of integrity in their behaviour.

Findings from UN Leadership Study.

In 2010, a UN senior leader who was part of the UN Secretariat, Fabricio Hochschild-Drummond, undertook a study of leadership within the UN. He conducted many interviews across the practitioners of UN peace operations, both in positions of senior leadership and followship. So in many respects it was a 360 degree assessment of UN leadership. His report is worth reading by anyone interested in this subject, but his seven paraphrased findings in italics below make for an insightful concluding piece with my interpretive comments to this study paper. (Slides 20 and 21)

- *Individuals do not automatically become leaders by virtue of being appointed to senior positions.* We have already discussed that leadership is a process of influence and not a position of authority. Leadership has to be demonstrated, and followship, which is always voluntary, has to be earned.
- *Leadership in the UN is about not being resigned to, but overcoming the restraints, and is also about creating the space for independent action.* This speaks to good leadership managing to articulate a vision and give a direction when all around looks difficult and confusing. It is about finding ways to overcome the many obstacles that will be in the way of any UN leader, both internally and externally. This can bring risk and therefore takes courage.
- *UN leadership is about managing and growing beyond a series of contradictions.* This speaks to the ambiguity in much of the environment of a peace operation, in which many issues and stake holders are in tension. How to make progress while retaining impartiality and personal integrity is often a challenge.
- *Leadership in the UN is as much about courage and risk as it is about caution.* This is saying that while there must be a balance, a fear of failure will most often lead to inaction. While recklessness is never advisable, excessive caution will result in mandate stalemate or failure. If easy solutions were readily available the UN would never be needed. Most problems where the UN is deployed are intractable and will not respond readily to a cautious approach. This is especially true when the use of force by the UN is needed to protect civilians. Too often, through cautious and uncertain leadership nothing is done. There is a philosophy amongst good UN leaders that views the mandate not as a ceiling beyond which the mission or its components must not go (the cautious approach) but as a spring board for positive action, knowing what needs to be done to make progress. Again, this takes courage for there will be many who share success but failure will always be lonely. Having said, that good leadership is unafraid of failure and learns from it.
- *UN leadership is about external and internal coalition building.* This speaks to transformational leadership, for it recognizes that a UN leader's transactional power and authority, the area of control, is limited. Instead much of the work needed to succeed in a peace operation lies outside this area of control and with the external partners, both within the mission area and elsewhere. This area of influence is widespread, and contains many stakeholders. Not all will be supportive. Achieving the needed support for the vision and the desired course of action requires skills of communication and inspiration.
- *Successful UN leaders respect, care for and empower their staff.* This is the articulation of "pathos". Again it is making a transformational leadership point, which focuses on the need to earn followship.

- *UN leadership is less about individuals than it is about creating strong leadership teams.* So much poor leadership is ego driven. The mistaken focus is on the transactional trappings of power and authority. It is prevalent on UN missions in which the UN system often seems to reinforce the culture of the revered senior leader. The antidote to this is humility, which is in itself a key trait of good leadership. A quote by Harry S Truman is relevant here: “It is amazing what you can achieve when you do not care who takes the credit”. This speaks to the need to take the “I” out of leadership and instead invest the energy on building the team. The point above shows how this must be done.

As a final note on this, the list of what is needed for good leadership is always long and daunting. People new to the UN system often wonder whether they have the expertise or the personality to demonstrate good leadership. A useful technique is perhaps not just to think of good leaders whom you have admired, and therefore must try to emulate, but also to think of those people who were in positions of power and authority and who showed poor or no leadership. You will get closer to good leadership simply by determining to avoid their behaviour and their mistakes.

Conclusion

The 7 Hochschild-Drummond points above are useful indicators to what is needed in UN leadership. It is the nature of the environment, the opaqueness of authority and responsibility, and the complexity of the multi-national, and multi-disciplinary structures, which make it different from national leadership. UN leadership is about operating in an extreme, ambiguous, dangerous and complex environment; the task at all levels is to provide vision and direction when all around is confusion, while being able to manage constant change (and crises) through good planning skills (starting at the why) by building integrated teams through the empowerment of staff and by communicating well and widely.

Leadership in UN operations is not for everybody. It is time and energy sapping and often overwhelming. It does demand a wide set of leadership skills including stamina, patience and a fair dose of good luck. Despite this the rewards, in terms of being able to make a difference, are enormous, and there is always the richness and stimulation of working with brave, good, committed people from across the world’s cultures who deserve good leadership. The UN does not invest enough in the training and preparation of its leaders. Too often it shows. This must change for unless member states have confidence in the leadership of UN peacekeeping missions they will be reluctant to commit their resources and their people to support them.

A leader is someone who knows the way, goes the way and shows the way.

Logos, Ethos, Pathos.

Robert Gordon

January 2016

Annex A: Some Brief Words on Leadership and Management

Annex B: Notes on the Author

Annex A

Leadership and Management

The word and the concept of leadership for many years was unconsciously avoided in the UN. Everything was termed as good management as if the term leadership made the UN uncomfortable with its over tones of militarism. The private sector have never had such inhibitions and much leadership theory and discussion now emanates from there. Clearly there is a place for good management. It is a key part of organizational leadership and the concept of instrumental leadership is based on having the managerial competence to support good leadership, including transformational leadership. But the recognition now is that good management alone is not enough. There has to be vision. There are many ways to express this to illustrate the differences. I like the couplets below which I came across a few years ago, because it illustrates the difference between transformational and instrumental leadership, even if it seems a little hard on managers.

The leader innovates; the manager administers

The leader develops; the manager maintains

The leader focuses on people and behaviour; the manager focuses on systems, processes and structures

The leader inspire trust; the manager relies on control

The leader has a long range perspective; the manager has a short range view

The leader asks why and what; the manager asks how and when

The leader's eye is on the horizon; the manager's is on the bottom line

The leader challenges the status quo; the manager accepts it

The leader does the right thing; the manger does things right.

RG

Annex B

Notes on the Author

Robert Gordon had a full career in the British Army, including serving as Sector Commander in UNPROFOR Bosnia in 1994-5, being the British Army's Director of Corporate Communications, and commanding the British Army in Scotland and the North of England. His final post in uniform was to serve as the UN Force Commander in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) 2002 - 2004. He retired from the British Army in 2005, and since then has worked on projects for UN DPKO/DFS, UN OIOS, the World Bank, UNDP, the British Government and others as an international lecturer, mentor and consultant on peacekeeping operations. In 2006-2007 he co-wrote and helped develop the UN's first strategic level doctrine (the "Capstone Doctrine") for peacekeeping. He is a Senior Adviser to the Challenges Forum, and was Special Adviser until 2013 to the late Pearson Centre of Canada. He is a course author and Board Member of the Peacekeeping Operations Training Institute (POTI). In 2005 he helped develop UN DPKO's senior mission leadership (SML) training programme and since then has been the lead mentor on all 21 UN courses. He is a facilitator of DPKO's Senior Leaders' Induction Programme and a facilitating mentor of UN DFS' SMART training programme. In 2009-2010, within the Challenges Partnership, he worked as editor on the "Considerations for Mission Leadership in UN Peacekeeping Operations" study. He lectures regularly on UN peacekeeping at the British Joint Staff College, the US Army War College, Carlisle, the Swedish Defence College, Stockholm and the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), amongst many others. Currently, he also works with UN OIOS in conducting mission evaluations of UN peacekeeping, and is on contract with UNDP as their Senior Security Sector Adviser in Iraq.