

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER I	
IN SEARCH OF A DEFINITION OF PEACE OPERATIONS	
1 Introduction	11
2 The troubled lexicon of peace operations	13
2.1 Peace operations or peacekeeping?	14
2.2 Peace support	19
2.3 Peace enforcement	21
3 The key elements of peace operations – the trinity of virtues?	24
3.1 The consent of the host State	26
3.2 From neutrality to impartiality	27
3.3 The limited use of force	31
3.3.1 The limited use of force as an evolving principle of peace operations	31
3.3.2 The lack of a legal basis for the use of force in peace operations	34
4 The questioned legal basis of peace operations	36
4.1 UN peace operations	37
4.2 Peace operations established by regional organizations	39
5 The legal status of peace operations	43
5.1 The ‘normative approach’	45
5.2 The ‘factual approach’	42
5.3 Discussing the UN theory on the ‘transformation’ of military contingents into UN subsidiary organs	49
5.4 The features of national troops’ secondment: national <i>caveats</i> and the chain of command and control	52
5.5 Peace operations as ‘composed subsidiary organs’	56
6 A working definition of peace operations	58

## CHAPTER II

## RESPONSIBILITY REGIMES FOR PEACE OPERATIONS

1	A plurality of responsibility regimes for peace operations	63
2	International responsibility	66
2.1	The primacy of State responsibility	66
2.2	The responsibility of international organisations and the progressive development of international law	70
2.3	The responsibility of international organizations in peace operations	74
2.4	The shortcomings of international organizations: responsibility <i>à la carte</i> ?	76
3	Accountability: looking for a legal definition	78
3.1	The origins of accountability and the notion of ‘civil servant’	81
3.2	The accountability of international organizations	83
3.3	Accountability in peace operations	87
3.4	Critical remarks on accountability	90
4	Liability	92
4.1	Liability and international responsibility: main differences	95
4.2	The relevance of liability in peace operations	98
5	Responsibility regimes and remedies in peace operations	100

## CHAPTER III

## INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY FOR PEACE OPERATIONS

1	Introduction	105
2	Whose responsibility? Attribution of conduct in peace operations	107
3	The centrality of art. 7 ARIO	109
3.1	The notion of ‘disposal’	111
3.2	The vexed topic of ‘effective control’	112
3.3	The relevance of internal agreements and the opposition of international organizations to art. 7 ARIO	116
4	The (limited) contribution of case law to the interpretation of art. 7 ARIO	121
4.1	The European Court of Human Rights: ‘ultimate authority and control’ or ‘effective control’?	122
4.2	The European Court of Human Rights: the ‘merging approach’	126
4.3	Attribution of conduct before domestic courts	130
4.3.1	Effective control and dual attribution in Dutch case law	130
4.3.1.1	<i>Nubanovic</i> and <i>Mustafic</i> : art. 7 ARIO as the key to attribution of conduct in peace operations	132

4.3.1.2	The <i>revirement</i> of the Dutch Supreme Court in the <i>Mothers of Srebrenica II</i>	138
4.3.2	Attribution of conduct before UK courts: looking at the chain of command and control	142
4.3.3	The Belgian case of <i>Mukeshimana-Ngulinzira</i> : ‘ultimate control’ and ‘exclusive control’	145
5	Looking at art. 7 ARIO through the chain of command and control	147
5.1	Transfer of authority, full command and operational control	148
5.2	Political authority vs military command and control	152
6	Dual attribution and the ‘reciprocal approach’ to art. 7 ARIO	153
7	Attribution of conduct in peace operations: conclusions <i>de iure con-</i> <i>cedendo</i>	159
8	International responsibility and remedies in peace operations	163
8.1	The primary role of domestic courts	164
9	The issue of individually enforceable rights	166
9.1	The judicial practice on individually enforceable rights in peace operations	167
9.2	The lack of a general theory on individually enforceable rights under international law	172
9.3	The proposed solution: textual and systemic interpretation of international norms	174
9.3.1	The ‘vertical element’ of textual interpretation	175
9.3.2	Systemic interpretation and the normative environment	177
9.3.3	Textual and systemic interpretation in the context of peace operations	180
10	Challenging the immunity of international organizations before domestic courts	182
10.1	Trends in judicial practice concerning peace operations	186
10.2	Challenging the immunity of international organizations through the prism of functionality	188
11	Conclusions	193

## CHAPTER IV

## ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PEACE OPERATIONS

1	Introduction	199
2	Accountability mechanisms for peace operations: the institutional aspects	200
2.1	The experience of territorial administrations in Kosovo and the prevalence of ‘active’ accountability mechanisms	200
2.1.1	The UNMIK Ombudsperson	202

2.1.2	The UNMIK Human Rights Advisory Panel	204
2.1.3	The EULEX Human Rights Review Panel	208
2.2	Accountability mechanisms to address sexual exploitation and abuse (SEA) in peace operations	210
2.2.1	'Passive' accountability mechanisms	214
2.2.2	'Active' accountability mechanisms	218
2.2.3	Accountability of States in UN-led peace operations: the role of UN SC Res 2272(2016)	220
2.2.4	Accountability of States in UN-authorized missions	223
2.2.5	Accountability for SEA towards individuals	226
2.3	UN Trust Funds for victims in peace operations	228
2.3.1	The UN Haiti Cholera Response Multi Partner Trust Fund	229
2.3.2	The UN Trust Fund for Victims of SEA	233
3	Allocation of accountability: a topic which remains unexplored	236
3.1	Allocation of accountability during territorial administrations	238
3.2	Allocation of accountability for SEA and 'off-duty' actions	241
3.3	Allocation of accountability for SEA to the sending State	243
3.4	Allocation of accountability for SEA to the UN: 'acknowledgement' of accountability?	244
3.5	Allocation of accountability: tentative conclusions	249
4	Accountability and remedies	250
4.1	Drawing the theoretical framework	250
4.2	The content of the individual right to an effective remedy under international law	252
4.3	The right to an effective remedy in cases of mass claims	256
4.4	The right to an effective remedy and international organizations	259
4.5	Accountability mechanisms for peace operations and the right to an effective remedy	263
4.6	Accountability and the right to an effective remedy during the territorial administrations of Kosovo	265
4.7	UN Trust Funds in peace operations and the right to an effective remedy	266
5	Conclusions	270

## CHAPTER V

## LIABILITY FOR PEACE OPERATIONS

1	Liability and claims mechanisms for peace operations	275
2	The institutional aspects of liability mechanisms for peace operations	277
2.1	The United Nations claims system	277

2.1.1	The evolution of UN liability mechanisms: financial and temporal limitations	279
2.1.2	The unique case of the lump sum agreements in the Congo	281
2.2	NATO liability mechanisms in peace operations	285
2.2.1	The lack of a uniform claims system	285
2.2.2	The IFOR/SFOR claims system in Bosnia Herzegovina and Croatia	287
2.2.3	The KFOR claims system	290
2.2.4	NATO liability mechanisms in Afghanistan	292
2.3	EU liability mechanisms in peace operations	296
2.3.1	The EU claims system: the EU Model Status of Force Agreement	296
2.3.2	The practice of the EU claims system	298
3	Attribution of liability in peace operations	300
3.1	The conceptual gap and the theoretical hypothesis	300
3.2	The practice of claims systems in peace operations	303
4	Liability and remedies	306
4.1	Prompt and adequate compensation as a principle of international liability	307
4.2	The 'private law character' of third-party claims under the UN claims policy	309
4.3	'Operational necessity' and 'combat-related' exceptions	313
4.4	The role of <i>ex gratia</i> payments	316
5	Conclusions	318
	CONCLUSIONS	321
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	333