WHOSE FREEDOM FROM FEAR? SECURITY SECTOR REFORM OF THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

Maj J.E.P. Collette

JCSP 37	PCEMI 37
Master Of Defence Studies	**Maîtrise en Études de la Défense**
Disclaimer	**Avertissement**

CANADIAN FORCES COLLEGE – COLLÈGE DES FORCES CANADIENNES
JCSP 37 – PCEMI 37

MASTER OF DEFENCE STUDIES – MAÎTRISE EN ÉTUDES DE LA DÉFENSE

WHOSE FREEDOM FROM FEAR? SECURITY SECTOR REFORM OF THE PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY

Maj J.E.P. Collette

Word Count: 17 296

Compte de mots : 17 296

ABSTRACT

This research paper addresses Palestinian Authority (PA) Security Sector Reform (SSR) through the lens of the Canadian military contribution to the United States Security Coordinator to Israel and the PA (USSC). It proposes improvements to the delivery of reforms in the context of the Israel-Palestine dispute. Since 2007, PA SSR under the "Security First, West Bank First" construct is taking place in a multi-national, multi-agency environment, mandated to work closely with and help develop professional, sustainable PA security forces, which are accountable to civilian authority and ostensibly exist to secure the Palestinian people from internal and external threats. In practice, most SSR environments are highly differentiated and dependent for success on national ownership and acknowledgment of local political conditions. The research will draw attention on Israeli and Western approaches to security that often prevent local ownership of reforms from taking root. Framing the analysis through key SSR stakeholders and environmental factors constraining these same actors, potential approaches to improve delivery will be discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

*Investing heavily in Palestinian security reform is not
a substitute for direct involvement in the peace process.
In fact, without progress on the peacemaking
front, the Palestinian security forces will be unable
to gain the respect of the public, and unlikely to perform
their stated objectives.* [1]

– Mohammad Yaghi

Since the institution of limited Palestinian self-rule in the West Bank and Gaza

Strip following the Oslo Accords of the 1990s, the Security Sector Reform (SSR) of the

Palestinian Authority (PA) is seen as an important enabler if not a *sine qua non* condition

for any eventual outcome in the Middle East Peace Process (MEPP).[2] In 2005, the United

States started a major undertaking to reform specific components of the PA security

sector with the support of Canada, the UK, Germany and Turkey among others. Over the

years, each of these nations have provided specialists in the security, logistics and

governance fields, demonstrated support for the PA and funding to help them attain

generally accepted levels of reform based on Western democratic ideals. Given its

inauspicious beginnings under Chairman Yasser Arafat, the PA has come a long way but

it is nevertheless still plagued by the dichotomy that without progress in the MEPP writ

large, security reforms can only help set the conditions in which an independent

Palestinian state may eventually emerge.

PA SSR was born out of Western and Israeli needs for security and in an attempt

to prevent a complete takeover of Palestinian society by Hamas following their victory in

---

[1] Mohammad Yaghi, "Rules for Engagement in Palestinian Political Affairs," in *Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace*, ed. David Pollock, Washington Institute for Near-East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015: 18.
[2] J.D. Crouch, Montgomery C. Meigs and Walter B. Slocombe, "Security First: US Priorities in Israeli-Palestinian Peacemaking," Washington Institute for Near East Policy Report. 2008: 2.

legislative elections and a military coup ousting the PA from the Gaza Strip in 2007. The risk posed by a replay of this event in the West Bank still informs todays' basic assumptions and decisions about PA SSR. In SSR literature, reform stakeholders, donors and other initiating actors often anticipate that benefits will accrue to the society undergoing the reforms as justice and the rule of law naturally evolve from ever more accountable and transparent control of the security sector by civilian institutions. However, as this research will show, PA security sector reforms were and are still often reframed to suit Western and Israeli approaches to security which prevents them from becoming fully embedded in, and sustained in Palestinian institutions. An immediate re-assessment of the PA SSR framework using a first principles approach based on Palestinian national ownership of reforms and acknowledgement of political realities is required to determine how this challenge can be overcome.

To begin the analysis, Chapter 1 will define SSR as it is currently defined and practiced, making specific reference to the Israel-Palestine context. The literature and research surrounding SSR always tends towards a small number of first principles that in theory, and if followed, maximize the potential for the return of stable and safe post-conflict societies. Chapter 2 – The Israel-Palestine SSR Players introduces the major SSR stakeholders and explains some of the characteristics that are germane to our understanding of PA security reforms. An analysis of the current PA SSR environment in Chapter 3 provides a simplified look at factors affecting reforms in the context of the Israel-Palestine dispute. Finally, Chapter 4 presents SSR best practices and will discuss recommendations to improve the delivery of PA SSR through a re-assessment of the situation leading to the promotion of PA national ownership of reforms. This last chapter

will also discuss how Canada should approach the current situation and balance its own SSR contribution to support the PA.

CHAPTER 1 – SECURITY SECTOR REFORM PRIMER

To help understand the objectives of the Security Sector Reform (SSR) Program being conducted within the PA, it is necessary to explain the evolution and drivers of the concept since the end of the Cold War. The United Nations (UN) defines SSR as "a process of assessment, review and implementation as well as monitoring and evaluation of the security sector, led by national authorities, and that has as its goal the enhancement of effective and accountable security for the State and its peoples, without discrimination and with full respect of human rights and the rule of law."[3] This definition labels it as a process to be carried out primarily by the state that undertakes reform, rather than an activity carried out by external organizations like foreign military or police forces. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), another main actor working to define the normative guidelines of SSR, uses the terms Security System Reform, Security- Governance Reform and Justice Reform as similar concepts but for clarity, the term SSR will be used throughout this paper. The OECD further states that SSR "…aims essentially at transforming poorly governed or ineffective security agencies into professional and accountable institutions that operate effectively and efficiently in a manner consistent with the principles of democratic governance."[4] Despite these unambiguous descriptions, SSR remains an umbrella term that several actors, among them

---

[3] United Nations, "Security Sector Reform: Definitions," Accessed 4 Apr 2015. http://unssr.unlb.org/SSR/Definitions.aspx.

[4] Louise Riis Andersen, "Security Sector Reform and the Dilemmas of Liberal Peacebuilding," *Danish Institute of International Studies Working Paper* 2011:31, 2011: 9.

the OECD and the UN, have been striving to apply in practice since the 1990s and work continues to engage the international community to establish normative guidelines and to define the ideal outcomes of SSR in a variety of real scenarios.[5]

As a concept, SSR grew out of a perceived necessity in the donor and academic communities during the post-Cold War period of the 1990s.[6] A founding assumption of SSR posits that the linkages and need for synchronization between security and development assistance are re-enforced in the SSR setting as development cannot hope to be sustained without basic security being in place.[7] The OECD further amplifies the importance of this "security-development nexus," stressing the need for development and SSR actors to work coherently together, ideally using the whole of government (WOG) approach.[8] If executed correctly, SSR should lead to the development of security institutions that represent the civil authority, are self-sustainable and no longer a source of insecurity and fear themselves.

Some SSR theorists and practitioners have stated that the overall object and benefactor of security reforms should be the individual rather than the state. This evolution of SSR and the associated state-centric understanding progressing towards a more people-centric approach is illustrated in table 1.1 below:

[5] Sarah Meharg and Aleisha Arnusch, "Security Sector Reform: A Case Study Approach to Transition and Capacity Building," January 2010. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=960: 2.

[6] Filip Ejdus, "Concept of Security Sector Reform Paper." Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.bezbednost.org/upload/document/(5)_ejdus.pdf. 2007: 63.

[7] USAID, DoD and DoS, "Security Sector Reform, Guidance Paper," 2009. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://issat.dcaf.ch/content/download/1855/15280/file/USAID%20SSR.pdf: 1.

[8] OECD, "Security Sector Reform: What Have We Learned?" 2009, Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/conflictandfragility/docs/44391867.pdf: 6.

Table 1.1– Evolution of SSR 1947-2015

Period	SSR Benefactors/Recipients	Associated Terms
Cold War 1947-1991	-States in US/Soviet sphere of influence -"Hard" security sector (militaries, intelligence agencies)	-Train and equip -Truman Doctrine -Containment
Post-Cold War	-Former Warsaw Pact nations -CIS nations -Failed and failing states -Non-state actors	-Democratization -Liberal Peace building -Global War on Terror -Intra-state conflict -Humanitarian intervention
Present Day	-The individual -"Soft" Security Sector (judiciary courts, Rule of Law, prison system) -Civil society -Governance sector	-Human security, freedom from fear/want -Security-development nexus -Poverty reduction -Capability building

Cold War security assistance emphasised building strategic alliances and as far as the US was concerned, containing the Soviet Union. There was little impetus to promote good security governance and no overall desire for client states to eventually develop into democracies.[9] The main benefactors of what can today be termed SSR programs, training, equipment and other aid funding, was the "hard" security sector, traditionally composed of the national military forces, Interior Ministries, under which could be found the national intelligence apparatus, the often feared *Mukhaberat* of most Middle Eastern states for example, and civilian police forces.[10] All these actors represent the narrow definition of the security sector.[11] As they courted American and Soviet influence and backing, client states where concerned with keeping this ruling establishment and

---

[9] Nicole Ball, "The Evolution of the Security Sector Reform Agenda." In *The Future of Security Sector Reform*, Ed. Mark Sedra, Center for International Governance Innovation 2010. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. https://www.cigionline.org/sites/default/files/The%20Future%20of%20Security%20Sector%20Reform.pdf: 29.

[10] Mehran Kamrava, *The Modern Middle East: A Political History Since the First World War*. 2nd ed., Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011: 96.

[11] Paul Jackson, "Security Sector Reform and State Building," *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 32, No. 10, 2011: 1811.

institutions in place. In fact, these "narrow sector" actors often constituted the main source of repression and insecurity towards their own population and also towards their neighbours. For the purposes of this research, the "broad" definition of the security sector as defined in Jackson (2011) will be used: "All those organizations which have authority to use, or order the use of, force, or the threat of force, to protect the state and its citizens, as well as those civil structures that are responsible for their management and oversight."[12] This broad sector will also include the individuals and organizations belonging to what is traditionally known as civil society. In today's PA-Israel context, SSR is a multi-lateral, multi-sector and multi-donor mechanism that by definition can and must engage more than the traditional "hard" security actors to be successful.

Andersen (2011) mentions that the complex interplay of security sector players needs to be optimized to improve overall security and not just the operational capabilities of major actors like the police or the military.[13] Practice suggests however that this piece-meal or ad hoc approach to reforming specific security actors or services is the one most often adopted by organizations undertaking to reform a given entity's security sector. Security actors often constitute the elite in a given society and may appear as moderates, the least bad option or "the devil you know" in an environment filled with extremists. To avoid starting from scratch and dealing with unknown variables, Western governments and donors often consider these moderates as amenable to the implementation of democratic reforms on the road to state building. As far as Israel and the US were concerned, the choice between Hamas and the PA was clear. The latter would become the recipient of large amounts of security assistance funding for the West Bank.

---

[12] *Ibid.*, 1804.
[13] Andersen, *Security Sector Reform and the Dilemmas of…*,10.

The state-centric SSR model held until Cold War ended with the collapse of the Soviet Union and the loss of its influence on client states. In the following era of hybrid or new wars, failed and failing states faced a vicious cycle marked by the loss of traditional sources of security. This allowed the remnants of state institutions and a host of non-state actors, who combined with often aggressive external armed intervention to create ungoverned spaces characterized by the total absence of security. This security vacuum was seen as a major factor why development assistance could not be delivered to alleviate even the most basic humanitarian needs of the population. Further, remaining state security elements were often the very source of insecurity and instability, preying on their populations and preventing a return to normal conditions.

The end of the 1990s, witnessed a growing realization among democratic countries involved in state building, that development and security in post-conflict, transitional or failed states were closely related. This "security-development nexus" implied that "Security and development are inextricably linked and indivisible: One cannot be pursued without the other."[14] The situation in states like Somalia, the Former Yugoslavia, Afghanistan and Iraq after the American intervention required that security and development actors better synchronize and coordinate their actions as part of their respective governments' strategies as well as how they implemented them on the ground. In Wolff (2001), state building doctrine posits that the quick imposition of security by any means is first and foremost and often the only viable option but that a "security only" approach "…cannot succeed in achieving the twin outcomes of peace and democracy

---

[14] *Ibid.*, 5.

after conflict.[15] This is the case of the PA SSR discussed in this research where a Security First-West Bank First approach was initially taken, creating strong security services, at the expense of institutions like the Ministry of the Interior (MOI) and the judiciary.[16] In the past two decades, security sector reforms have also become an alternative to forceful intervention in the context of the US led Global War on Terror (GWOT) and succeeding US strategies. SSR ostensibly supports and strengthens several state and non-state actors in order to secure US interests at home and abroad. This facet of SSR as counter-terrorism or counter-insurgency will be further discussed in Chapter 3.

The 1990s were also a period where SSR took off as a concept to address the various understandings of security writ large. Practitioners now had to take into consideration the dynamics between traditional and emerging sources of state and non-state-centric security, the root causes of insecurity, security as a common good, and the individual as the ultimate referent object of security reforms. Today, SSR is acknowledged by the UN's Security Council and the General Assembly as a central component of the organization's peacekeeping, peacebuilding and development agendas.[17] With the benefit of experience gained through involvement in a number of SSR contexts in various countries (but not the PA, specifically), the UN and the OECD have become repositories for the normative aspects of SSR. Both highlight the need for national ownership of SSR activities, a comprehensive, multi-layered approach to transform institutions and the laws that underpin them. As well, both organizations state that these activities should be people centered and show due respect for human rights, one

---

[15] Stefn Wolff, "Post-Conflict State Building: the Debate on Institutional Choice," *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 32 No. 10, 2011: 1779.

[16] Crouch, *et al.*, *Security First: US Priorities*…, 5.

[17] United Nations, "Second Secretary-General's Report on SSR (A/67/970–S/2013/480)," Accessed 4 Apr 2015. http://unssr.unlb.org/Resources/UNDocuments/tabid/255/currentpage/1/Default.aspx.

of the UN's core principle of its SSR approach.[18] The first item concerning national ownership does not seem like a priority, SSR actors want or are able to take on while the second often appears often as a major SSR "selling point" when describing the efforts to vet individual PASF candidates and include respect for human rights in their training curriculum.

The Government of Canada (GC) subscribes to the UN's ideals on security reforms and is a member of the OECD's Development Assistance Committee (DAC), and it does have a unified framework for implementing SSR.[19] However, linking the contributions of its various departments and agencies within a comprehensive policy supported by funding is still problematic. Lacking a comprehensive approach, many actors cannot keep pace with the normative recommendations of the UN and the OECD. This is largely due to the unequal capacity of the multitude of SSR actors required to integrate these normative ideals and coordinate amongst each other before even having an effect in the host nation (HN) that is the target of reforms.[20] Case in point, the Canadian military is involved in SSR of the PA since 2005, yet aspects of the work it conducts along with examples from other similar missions has just now been codified in a doctrine that remains at the draft stage in early 2015.

SSR is more a process than a specific activity. It describes an overarching framework inside which a number of tasks belonging to the realm of what are called

---

[18] United Nations, "The United Nations and Security Sector Reform: The Way Forward." *Report prepared by the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces on behalf of the Slovak Republic.* 5-6 Mar 2013: 14.

[19] Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, "Security System Reform,"Accessed 6 May 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/start-gtsr/ssr-rss.aspx?lang=eng .

[20] Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, *SSR in a Nutshell: Manual for Introductory Training on Security Sector Reform*, The International Security Sector Reform Advisory Team, 2012: 20.

stability operations take place. Stability operations are defined in Canadian doctrine as

"specific missions and tasks carried out by armed forces to maintain, restore, or establish

a climate of order."[21] Following recent experience in Iraq and Afghanistan, US military

doctrine notes that stability operations have replaced combat power alone as the

traditional objective of security.[22] Further, stability operations are now on par with

offensive and defensive operations within an overarching full-spectrum operations

framework.[23] There is growing understanding among military actors that SSR has arrived

as a concept and that armed forces are extremely likely to become involved in the process

either to prevent a major conflict, at its conclusion or at a transition stage such as the one

represented by the example of the PA.

Table 1.2 – Canadian and US doctrinal definitions of SSR

Canadian Doctrine - SSR	US Doctrine - SSR
"SSR seeks to enable conditions conducive to long-term stability, security, development, poverty reduction and democracy by the establishment of security institutions that are effective, affordable, accountable, responsive, representative and sustainable."[24]	"The set of policies, plans, programs, and activities that a government undertakes to improve the way it provides safety, security, and justice. SSR aims to provide an effective and legitimate public service that is transparent, accountable to civil authority and responsive to the needs of the public."[25]

As Table 1.2 above shows, Canada and the US have similar approaches to the process of

SSR and recognize that military forces are but one component among many and that these

can only be committed once the overarching SSR construct has been decided on. Once

this framework is in place, military forces engage in the types of sub-activities described

---

[21] Department of National Defense, CFJP 01, *Canadian Military Doctrine Manual*. Ottawa: DND Canada 2011: 6-12.

[22] Corri Zoli and Nicholas J. Armstrong, "Post 9/11 Stability Operations: How US Army Doctrine is Shaping National Security Strategy," *PRISM* Vol. 2, No.1 December 2010:105.

[23] *Ibid.*, 105.

[24] Department of National Defense, *CFJP 01…,* 6-12.

[25] Department of Defense, *Joint Doctrine Note 1-13: Security Force Assistance*, 29 April 2013: viii.

in table 1.3 below to deliver their effects on the ground. The tasks that the Canadian

military carry out in support of SSR of the PA at the operational and institutional levels

belong to what is termed Security Force Capacity Building (SFCB). Conceptually, SFCB

is part of the much larger undertaking of SSR.[26] Canadian SFCB takes place within a

United States Government (USG) framework of Security Sector Assistance (SSA) to the

PA. Both doctrines recognize that these activities can take place in all phases of the

spectrum of conflict from conventional combat to peace time stability operations.[27]

Table 1.3 – US SSA Framework and Canadian doctrinal definitions of SSR sub-activities

Canadian Activities - Security Force Capacity Building (SFCB)	US Framework - Security Sector Assistance (SSA)
"Those activities undertaken to develop the institutional and operational capabilities of foreign security forces, in order to create appropriate, effective and legitimate security institutions and forces."[28]	"Security Sector Assistance is aimed at strengthening the ability of the United States to help allies and partner nations build their own security capacity, consistent with the principles of good governance and rule of law."[29]

Canadian SFCB doctrine places a great emphasis on the "other", the entity or

individual that is to be supported, reformed or otherwise transformed but accepts that in

the end, efforts will be applied in accordance with Canada's national interests and policies

This point serves to highlight an extremely real constraint facing PA SSR in that the state

of Israel is a major stakeholder in security reforms and thereby PA SSR into a kind of

hybrid, unlike any other SSR setting currently ongoing.

Military forces should never end up conducting tasks related to SSA/SSR/SFCB

independently from other partners. The WOG approach to SSR is represented within the

---

[26] Department of National Defense, B-GL-323-000/FP-001, *Security Force Capacity Building*, Ottawa: DND Canada, 2014: 1-1-1.

[27] Department of Defense, FM 3-07.1, *Security Force Assistance,* 2009: 1-1.

[28] Department of National Defense, *Security Force Capacity Building*, 1-3.

[29] Department of Defense, *Security Force Assistance,*1-7.

UK Department for International Development (DFID). Here, theory and practice based on the UK experience which started in Sierra Leone in the late 90s subsequently led to what Jackson (2011) describes as "…the creation of a system of cross-government working that integrated aspects of security and development into something that became known as SSR."[30] The Conflict Prevention Pool approach where UK government policy, priorities, and most importantly departmental funding are concentrated to deliver SSR effects with the objective of poverty reduction was evaluated by Ball (2004) and found to have done "…significant work funding worthwhile activities that make positive contributions to effective conflict prevention."[31] This approach is often cited as having a positive effect, in particular with the evolving SR process in Sierra Leone in the early 2000s. Its chief quality being a coherent strategy among the players involved and stable sources of funding.[32] This approach was also augmented by the creation of a central, high level Security Sector Advisory Team (SSAT) within Whitehall to advise on SSR.[33] This oversight and governance body however ceased to operate in 2005 due to financial constraints. Using the Conflict Prevention Pool approach, the UK is present in the Palestinian Territories with two modest projects delivering security by providing technical assistance to the PA Ministry of the Interior and towards civilian policing and the rule of law.[34]

---

[30] Jackson, *Security Sector Reform and State Building*, 1803.
[31] Nicole Ball, Evaluation of the Conflict Prevention Pools: The Security Sector Reform Strategy,"March 2004. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.oecd.org/derec/unitedkingdom/35096612.pdf: iv.
[32] Jackson, *Security Sector Reform and State Building*, 1803.
[33] *Ibid*., 1814.
[34] British Consulate-Jerusalem, "Supporting the Stability and Peace in the OPTs," 9 May 2013, Accessed 3 May 2015. https://www.gov.uk/government/world-location-news/supporting-stability-and-peace-in-the-opts.

As we have seen, from the evolution of SSR through the end of the Cold War, there is no well-worn path to success.[35] Every actor's approach will be different based on their national doctrine, national objectives to be attained but also limited by the availability of other donor funding to support the often forgotten "soft" security sector. The particular case of the PA's quasi-state status, existing under military occupation, and subsisting mainly through donor funding further complicates SSR implementation. Without being naïve and forgetting ones' own national interests, SSR is supposed to be about the "other," and when it is not, buy-in and a sense of ownership from the intended benefactors of the SSR program, the PA in this case, cannot develop equally across the entire security sector.

Coherent or comprehensive approaches to SSR seem to have more success than ad hoc ones as is the evidence shown in the DFID Conflict Prevention Pool approach. Reaching down into a society, to back hand-picked "hard" security actors or circumvent already existing ones does not promote national ownership of reforms. Finally, SSR is a long-term undertaking. From a USG point of view, it is a complex process that requires multi-stakeholder buy-in and coordination. The SSR work being carried out in the PA by USSC is by its very nature a hybrid in the sense that it is carried out for the benefit of Israel's security with an offset goal of reforming the PA security sector.

---

[35] Zoli and Armstrong, *Post 9/11 Stability Operations…,* 106.

"Palestinian society is not fragile because it lacks
a state. It is fragile because the PA contributes to
this fragility."[36]

- Anne LeMore

CHAPTER 2 – ISRAEL-PALESTINE SSR PLAYERS

Any eventual re-assessment of the current PA SSR framework requires

understanding the characteristics of the major players or actors involved. SSR is by

definition a complex undertaking primarily due to the large numbers and types of actors

and their often differing if not completely opposed view points and objectives. The

coherence of the entire SSR process depends on knowing what these actors' interests are.

In this research, the two main players are obviously the PA as receiver and the US as

implementer of SSR. As stated in Chapter 2 is the peculiar position of the Government of

Israel as a player who often overrides initiatives seeking to improve the PA's situation.

Mistrust, amplified during the conduct of the Second Intifada makes it very difficult for

these two entities to work productively together, even under the long term framework of

the US initiated Roadmap for Peace Agreement and the Office of the Quartet

Representative. In 2005, the US Secretary of State, Condoleezza Rice set up the USSC,

with partners including Canada and the UK soon joining in, to take the lead for

coordinating SSR between Israel and the PA. Today, the SSR field is further diluted by a

number of miscellaneous actors such as several Arab states, Palestinian civil society, an

extensive donor community and others who do much to influence the ability of the PA to

create its own institutions and take ownership of its own security reforms.

---

[36] Heather Marquette and Danielle Beswick, Introduction to, "State Building, Security and Development: State Building as a New Development Paradigm," *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 32, No. 10 2011: 1711.

Much of the early reforms carried out with the PA involved curbing local militias, militants and criminal elements operating in the West Bank and Gaza. These tasks were never accomplished effectively under Yasser Arafat. It was only following his death and the election of Mahmood Abbas to succeed him that bringing the monopoly on the use of force under one elected and legitimate authority started in earnest. An important characteristic of actors involved in SSR is this relationship to the use of force. To explain, Table 1.4 provides a simplified look at actors involved in PA SSR and the important point to recall is that no matter the actor involved, the State of Israel is always present to monitor and control the process, a characteristic and pervasive state presence that is absent from most SSR scenarios.

Table 1.4 – Holistic Matrix of Security Sector Actors

Statutory actors who have the right to use force (military, police, intelligence services etc.)	State of Israel	Non-statutory actors who have the right to use force (private security companies, paramilitary units etc.)
Statutory actors who do not have the right to use force (parliament, judiciary, independent bodies etc.)		Non-statutory actors who do not have the right to use force (civil society organization, media, universities etc.)

Source: Ejdus, Filip, "Concept of Security Sector Reform Paper." Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.bezbednost.org/upload/document/(5)_ejdus.pdf. 2007: 64.

The PA and PASF

The chief characteristics of the PA are its transitional nature, perceived lack of legitimacy, factionalism and its almost exclusive dependence on external assistance for survival. The PA initially came into being as a result of the Oslo process of the 1990s granting limited self-rule to Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza. The PLO signed the first Oslo Accord in 1993 and the PA was created as a transitional governing body with partial administrative and security control over Areas A and B (excluding Israeli

settlements, international borders, coast and airspace) ceded to it by Israel in the West

Bank and Gaza.[37] Area A which makes up roughly 21% of the West Bank is composed of

major Palestinian urban centers under PA control while Area B, roughly 25% of the West

Bank, is under PA civil and Israeli security control. The remaining majority portion of

the occupied territories, Area C, is under full Israeli control and contains the majority of

agricultural lands, settlements, access roads, nature reserves and military training areas.

The PA thus finds itself securing a Palestinian population living in densely inhabited

areas which are not contiguous and where restrictions exist on the movement of PASF.

For the moment, the PA is the primary body with which Israel and the international

community deal with on SSR issues even though the PLO is still the official organization

representing all Palestinians regardless of status. If Palestinian statehood is ever achieved,

the PA will be replaced by the government of the new state of Palestine.[38] During the

second Intifada of 2000-2004, the PA failed to reliably control popular uprisings and stop

militant attacks on Israel. Its security forces, nominally under Yasser Arafat, even took

up arms against Israel and as a result PA security forces and infrastructure was largely

destroyed by Israel while land formerly ceded to the PA was re-occupied by Israel's

military. Despite its more than twenty years in existence, The PA's fragility and the lack

of continuity of its security institutions is the source of grave misgivings on the part of

Israel and makes SSR of the PA that much more difficult.

Within the PA, Fatah is the political party headed by President Abbas. As a

polity, the PA is split. No elections have been held since 2006 and several attempts at

forming a unity government with Hamas have led nowhere. In effect, half of the

---

[37] PASSIA, "PLO v.s. PA," Information pamphlet September 2014: 5.
[38] *Ibid.*, 5.

Palestinian body politic is at odds with the other half with little prospects for reconciliation.

Following the PA/Hamas split and the absence of a working legislature, President Mahmoud Abbas has ruled by decree since 2007. Abbas was at the head of the Palestinian team negotiating peace in Oslo and is seen by the West and the GOI as having renounced violence, thus constituting an acceptable, moderate leader with which to deal with regarding Palestinian affairs.[39] As head of both the PA and PLO, and in the absence of a working legislature, he effectively owns the responsibility for executive decision-making for almost all aspects that touch on security and reforms. Factionalism and political in-fighting that threatens his grip on power keeps President Abbas busy wrangling the inner workings of his own administration. It is reported that he seldom has time to dwell on the details of the issues that need to be addressed.[40]

As stated, one of the traditional aims of SSR is to return the monopoly on the use of force to the legitimate authority. The PA has now regained this monopoly in the West Bank. Because they exercise the use of force within the WB to arrest and harass Hamas militants and supporters as well as internal opponents of the PA, President Abbas and the PASF are seen by many Palestinians as Israeli stooges and collaborators.[41] A growing number or 66% of ordinary Palestinians have a similar attitude and further believe that security coordination with Israel prolongs the occupation.[42] The PA has and continues to deliver on Israeli security needs but it is not getting equal benefits in return except for a

---

[39] Jim Zanotti, "The Palestinians: Background and U.S. Relations," Congressional Research Service Report for Congress 7-5700, RL34074, 2015: 12.

[40] Author's conversations with local Palestinians.

[41] Jim Zanotti, "U.S. Security Assistance to the Palestinian Authority," Congressional Research Service, CRS Report for Congress 7-5700, R40664, 2009: 18.

[42] M. Gill, "Polling Palestinians," Survey Research, 9-14 September 2014.

relative social and economic stability, the latter underpinned and dependent on foreign

donations.

Regime security matters and the origins of the PASF are key to understanding

their current character and attitudes towards reform attempts. Since its inception in 1964,

the PLO from which many of the PA leadership originate today, conceptualized its

security forces in part by absorbing the security culture of countries that supported their

cause and hosted them in exile.[43] As a result, today's PA security sector contains

elements similar to authoritarian Arab states like Jordan, Lebanon and Tunisia. A

Presidential Guard and an intelligence apparatus directly beholden to the president,

National Security Forces - a kind of gendarmerie force also under the Office of the

President, as well as an agency akin to a secret police protect the person of the President,

keep tabs on various opponents of the PA and, disrupt would be terrorist cells in the West

Bank. While not stating that this is the case for the PA, Sayigh (2011) describes similar

structures and functions, that appear inefficient and evidence of unnecessary duplication

to an outsider as being a kind of "coup-proofing" insurance found in many Middle East

governments.[44] As far as Western nations are concerned intelligence reform is also

required, but most draw the line at collaborating with or supporting intelligence

organizations that have a spotty record of respecting human rights.[45] In this respect,

Western supporters of PA SSR have chosen to keep the security structures of

authoritarian governments intact and have picked and chosen which services to support at

---

[43] Aviad Rubin, "Political-Elite Formation and Transition to Democracy in Pre_state Conditions: Comparing Israel and the Palestinian Authority," *Government and Opposition* Vol 44, No. 3, 2009. 262-284: 279.

[44] Yezid Sayigh, "Agencies of Coercion: Armies and Internal Security Forces." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. Vol. 43. 2011: 403.

[45] Zanotti, *U.S. Security Assistance to…*, 23.

the expense of ignoring certain others. A piece-meal approach that does not strengthen institutional development of the PA.

It is not the aim of this paper to describe the PASF organizational structure in detail and a cursory understanding of its major divisions will illustrate points relevant to the SSR discussion. The PASF are composed of civilian security force services in the sense that they do not constitute a military force or a Palestinian Army and are structured along two main functional groups with their administrative and logistical enablers. The first functional group is under the office of the president and contains the Presidential Guard (PG) and the National Security Forces (NSF). The former service is directly beholden to the President and protects his person and associated PA facilities as well as visiting dignitaries. The latter service is designed to act in support of the civilian police forces in high risk arrests and crowd control situations where the police lack the training or the equipment. The second major functional group is under the office of the Ministry of the Interior (MoI) and is composed of the first responders, the Palestinian Civil Police responsible for community policing and criminal arrests. Finally, while technically not a security service, the Palestinian Civil Defence (PCD) tasks include search and rescue, medical evacuation and firefighting.

This PASF structure contains several legislative loopholes that make effective oversight difficult and built-in inefficiencies that the Security First-West Bank First agenda of Western donors, influenced by the GOI, seem to perpetuate. Specifically, Palestinian Basic Law enacted before the PA/Hamas split makes provisions for a National Security Council to decide on objectives and priorities but it is not being used. Also missing are key senior positions that could potentially regroup several individual services under a unified command structure. According to the PA's Strategic Security Sector

Plan, the positions of General Inspector, General Commander and Head of Internal Security are all unfilled.[46] This is a significant omission because all of these positions would yield more institutional authority than any current PASF officers and would potentially be able to harness the influence of their service subordinates. Having these individuals in place could provide for more unity of purpose and direction through the PA MOI which is something the Israelis do not necessarily want. Today, increasing oversight and improving institutional governance has not yet been elevated to the level it should be within PA SSR players and the corresponding absence of a clear reporting chain within the PASF perpetuates a system where individual services chiefs must petition the President for most important decisions as he holds all executive powers.

The PA's failure to thrive is also largely based on an inability to reach consensus on most issues of importance given significant internal and external divisions. Even agreeing on objectives and priorities for donor assistance funding can be problematic and lead to political in-fighting. According to Zanotti (2015), the PA's dependence on foreign assistance is acute given 48 years of often tight Israeli control over most aspect of the Palestinian territories' economy.[47] SSR should not be a zero sum game designed to benefit Israel and Western states only and need to be understood from the Palestinian citizens' point of view. Palestinian core interests according to Agha and Khalidi (2006) are fixed, essentially non-negotiable and pertain to national survival.[48] They include: 1. Prevent the destruction of the Palestinian people. 2. Remain on national territory, 3. End Israel's occupation and freedom from foreign rule, 4. Provide a safe haven and, 5.

---

[46] Palestinian Authority, "Security Sector Strategic Plan 2014-2016 Draft," April 2014.
[47] Zanotti, *The Palestinians: Background…*, 19.
[48] Hussein Agha and Hussein S. Khalidi, *A Framework for Palestinian National Security Doctrine*, (London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2006), 15-17.

Safeguard Palestinian territory. Given these core interests, it is easy to understand why consensus keeps eluding President Abbas. No decision that he can take will satisfy the interests of all the various categories of Palestinians. In the absence of a two state solution, PA SSR only affects West Bank Palestinians while the remainder wallows in the Gaza Strip under Hamas or dispersed in refugee camps all over the Middle East with no hope of return. Change is possible but Palestinians are hemmed in by their interests and PA and Israeli politicians are adept at using these divisions to further their political agendas. It therefore becomes important for donors and SSR actors to understand the internal dynamics they are facing

SSR should according to its doctrinal proponents, benefit all citizens, yet the PA and their security forces have been accused of constituting an elite within Palestinian society that uses the security forces to coerce and repress internal dissenters. The PASF has in fact become a major element of coercion itself within the West Bank while western SSR actors are involved in bankrolling this state of affairs.[49] Others accuse the PA civil service of having become a social safety net as successive PA governments have allowed the security forces ranks for example to become bloated with marginally effective personnel.[50]

To this point, the traditional hard security sector actors of the PA have been discussed. According to Meharg and Arnusch (2010), civil society is made up of professional organizations, civilian review boards…policy analysis organizations

---

[49] Sabrien Amrov and Alaa Tartir, "Subcontracting Repression in the West Bank and Gaza," *The New York Times* online, 26 November 2014. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/27/opinion/subcontracting-repression-in-the-west-bank-and-gaza.html?_r=0.
[50] Anne Le More, "Killing with Kindness: Funding the Demise of the Palestinian State." *International Affairs* Vol. 81, No. 5, 2005: 985.

…NGOs, media, women's groups and other actors.[51] These can have an important impact on the perceived security and safety experienced by the civilian population and act as a bellwether of the overall process. The charge against the PA by some observers is that Palestinian civil society is less vibrant today than before the Second Intifada despite a return of relative calm and prosperity to the West Bank coinciding with a resurgent PA under Abbas. The PA as opposed to most sovereign entities cannot even invoke the right of self-defense against the most likely threat of Israeli incursions in the West Bank. This situation leaves elements like opposition groups and various dissenters as well as civil society actors facing the risk of being coerced given that they are the only acceptable outlet for the PA's monopoly on the use of force.[52] Given limited staff capacity, the PA SSR conducted by USSC, has never been able to prioritize assistance to civil society or ensure that developments of the PASF at the very least, did not harm those in Palestinian society they are meant to protect.

To conclude, the PA and PASF characterisations as SSR players, it is important to emphasize their origins and the structures and expectations which they have not completely shed and which must be acted on by SSR actors trying to reform them. When one talks about increasing national ownership of reforms, the fragmented nature of the PA and their security forces compound the complexity of any SSR initiative undertaken. PA security force personnel have only ever served under Yasser Arafat or President Abbas and been subject to Israeli occupation measures and so do not have a role model for democratic forms of government and security practices. As a result their attitudes and

---

[51] Meharg and Arnusch, *Security Sector Reform: A Case Study…*, 2.
[52] Rubin, *Political-Elite Formation and Transition…*, 267.

expectations of themselves conform to similar security force structures in other Arab nations. These are factors that SSR practitioners must contend with at all times.

Israel and the Israeli Security Establishment

Israel is the country whose sovereignty and security needs are at the heart of current SSR initiatives and also the one receiving the most benefits from PA reforms. To Israelis and their security forces, reforming the PA security sector is seen as a double edged sword. In the early 2000s, the GOI acted swiftly and decisively in the face of PASF inaction during the Second Intifada. PA security forces in some cases, attacked Israeli forces and as a result, a large part of their personnel, infrastructure and equipment was destroyed. On the one hand, reforms are required to reduce the amount of Israeli security resources required in the West Bank, but at the same time, more reliable PASF could pose a threat by turning against Israel as they did in the past. Evidence of the lost trust between the PASF and IDF/ISF is still in evidence today, leading to intense scrutiny of any proposed PA security improvements. It is this need to filter and get approval from the Israeli military for everything that highlights the fact that SSR of the PA is not entirely conducted for the benefits of Palestinians.

Israel as indicated at Table 1.3 does not conduct SSR of the PA, yet it is a stakeholder in almost every decision regarding security reforms affecting Palestinians. The GOI agreed to the presence of the USSC and indeed all other donors and actors involved in SSR today. This requires all security donors to maintain close coordination with Israel if any reforms are to move forward. Israel has the right to accept or deny all USSC initiatives if it judges that they go against its own security requirements.

The occupation of Palestinian territories is a political reality underlying current SSR work. The Israeli policy to put "facts on the ground" includes continuing Israeli

settlement construction, a system of checkpoints and barriers to contain the population

and protect Israeli settlers and severe limitations to PASF movement and jurisdictions.

The GOI recently placed the whole reform enterprise at risk by withholding tax revenue

transfers to the PA for several months. Revenue transfers that pay almost the entire salary

base of the PA including the PASF. Despite the high level political posturing, the

operators at the operational and tactical levels do see the benefit of continued security

cooperation that the SSR work enables. An Israeli Defense Forces (IDF) presentation

using the biblical names Judea and Samaria for the West Bank, describes the area as a

source of instability but notes that one of the advantages of the current context is the

ongoing Israeli-PA security cooperation taking place there.[53]

The West Bank is under military rule since 1967 and administered very differently

from the rest of Israel. COGAT is the acronym of the Coordination of Government

Activities in the Territories. It functions much as an Israeli military plenipotentiary or

Governor in the West Bank. It has full administrative and security powers in Areas C

held by the Israelis and shares security and civil administrative functions in Areas A and

B with the Palestinians.[54] As stated, the IDF itself does not conduct SSR in the

Palestinian territories. It relies on the PA to maintain security for Israel indirectly. There

is little value once security is being delivered on a day to day basis to improve the PASF

institutions in any meaningful way. One can ask if the current arrangements that the

USSC facilitates are not similar to what Andersen (2011) describes as "the colonial

---

[53] State of Israel, Israeli Defense Force, *The Security Situation in Judea, Smaria & Jerusalem*, Slide Presentation, 2015: Slide 9.

[54] United States Security Coordinator, "West Bank: Palestinian Security Forces," Internal document, 2008: 42.

practice of ruling through middle men."[55] The system of closures that severely circumscribed the economy and personal freedom of movement has abated in the past three years and is showing slight signs of improvements. However, the control the IDF exerts over the occupied civilian population year after year is pervasive as exemplified in weekly IDF incursions into Palestinian territories and can be increased very quickly if the situation deteriorates. The PASF thus have an incentive to maintain security and ensure that any hard won relaxation of IDF security measures remain.

To be fair, Israel must contend with a very unstable regional security situation. With a growing Islamic State (IS) presence in the region, the Syrian civil War, Iranian nuclear proliferation, the fallout from the Arab uprisings and Hezbollah threatening its northern border, Israeli politicians have a lot to consider before even thinking about resuming negotiations leading to the two state solution or treating the situation of the PA as anything but a secondary effort. The current Israeli government stance under Netanyahu has essentially been that under proliferating uncertainties, Israel should avoid making crucial decisions.[56] At the moment, dealing with improvements to PA SSR to make it more democratic and accountable to the people appears to be low priority politically but there are signs on the ground that effective security coordination continues. This coordination however is often touted as a success story with almost daily arrests of Hamas militants and supporters by the PASF in the West Bank yet it does not implicitly include the long term development of PASF institutions.

Israel can live with President Abbas' increasingly authoritarian rule. As long as

[55] Andersen, *Security Sector Reform and the Dilemmas of…*, 5.
[56] Amr Yossef, "Israel and Post-Mubarak Egypt: Perils of Historical Analogy," *Digest of Middle-East Studies* Vol 21, No 1, 2012: 55.

security needs are met according to Klein (2013), "Israel traditionally prefers to maintain

close relations with non-democratic monarchs and dictators, rather than communicating

with the population or those that have gained popular support."[57] Another fact on the

ground is the power sharing structure within Palestinian society that Israel is willing to

tolerate. Today, Abu Mazen (President Abbas) controls the West Bank largely because of

Israel's occupation, while Hamas dominates Gaza despite its isolation.[58] Hanging on to

the West Bank physically by having settlements and IDF installations there makes

strategic sense to Israel as the idea it could deter any threat with airpower only and

punishing retaliation was disproven by the results of the 2006 Lebanon war and its

experience with Gaza following disengagement.[59] Given the preceding factors, the SSR

process in the West Bank is likely to continue to remain under constant scrutiny and

control by the Israelis. No half security measures will satisfy Israel and it will always

strive for a wide security margin that guarantees a peace that it can live with.[60] The

position of Israel in the current SSR construct forces external actors to maintain a position

firmly aligned with it as a condition for being able to continue their work with the PA

---

[57] Menachem Klein, "Is the Arab Spring Israel's Winter?" *Palestine Israel Journal* Vol. 18, No. 1, 2013: 27.

[58] Harvey Sicherman, "Playing for the Breaks," in *Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace*, ed. David Pollock, 10-12, Washington Institute for Near-East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus90.pdf.: 11.

[59] David Pollock, "Conclusion: Next Steps Towards Peace," In *Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace*, ed. David Pollock, 58-66. Washington Institute for Near- East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus90.pdf: 58.

[60] Yoram Peri, "The Political-Military Complex: The IDF's Influence Over Policy Towards the Palestinians Since 1987,", *Israel Affairs* Vol. 11, No. 2, 2005: 338.

The United States and United States Security Coordinator for Israel and the PA

The chief characteristic of SSR of the PA conducted by the USG is that it must

help its ally Israel and directly benefits the national interests of the US. Globally, the

USG places increased emphasis on security sector assistance (SSA) and is focussed on

improving links with partners who are trying to build strong democratic governance.[61]

The USG policy towards SSR of the PA includes support for security forces that are an

effective part of the criminal justice system, respect human rights, are accountable and

work transparently under civilian control. USG support is not a purely military pursuit

and overall responsibility and funding belongs to the US Department of State (DoS)

which appropriates funding from Congress for this purpose.[62] The Office of the United

States Security Coordinator (USSC) for Israel and the PA is a concrete contribution to

these efforts as the head of USSC reports directly to US the Secretary of State.[63]

The USSC is a small team of US military officers and advisors led by an

American Lieutenant-General whose mission "…assists the Palestinian Authority to

transform and professionalize its security sector; engages with the Israelis and

Palestinians on security initiatives that build trust and confidence in order to meet

Roadmap obligations and supports U.S. and international whole-of-government efforts

that set the conditions for a negotiated two-state solution."[64] The current mandate and US

and international efforts are delivered within the three pillars of 1. Security sector

---

[61] Department of State, "Enduring Leadership in a Dynamic World: Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review 2015," Accessed, 4 May 2015. http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/QDDR2015.pdf: 31.

[62] *Ibid*.

[63] Department of State, United States Security Coordinator for Israel and the Palestinian Authority (USSC), Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.state.gov/s/ussc/.

[64] *Ibid*.

governance, 2. Training and, 3. Support, including infrastructure logistics, maintenance and communications. The Canadian contribution to the USSC is heavily weighted in the support pillar. The USSC delivers non-lethal aid only such as infrastructure, equipment, vehicles and training as well as governance advice with full disclosure and transparency to the GOI.[65] All the potential Palestinian recruits the USSC intends to train need to be vetted by the USG and GOI before they start their training to ensure there are no ties to terrorist organizations and that they have not committed gross human rights abuses.[66] The original USSC concept called for the generation of some 2700 PG and 5500 NSF members who were to help secure the West Bank from threats posed by terrorist and militant networks.[67] While the need to build and develop PASF institutions was acknowledged soon after with the publication of the 2008-2010 Palestinian National Development Plan, observers agree that the priority was clearly on building up an armed force to counter terrorists and impose order quickly in the West Bank.

In a 2009 speech, Lieutenant-General Keith Dayton, the second US Coordinator and one of the major architect of today's PASF, stated that an IDF officer had remarked to him that the members inducted and instructed in the PASF represented what he termed "New Palestinian Men", a new class of PA public servants working for the security of the state and conversant with the proper use of force, the rule of law and human rights.[68] The PASF had and still have a long way to go to reach this ideal, not the least because of their PLO origins and weak governance oversight by PA civilian authorities.

---

[65] Zanotti, *U.S. Security Assistance to…*, 12.
[66] *Ibid.*, 14.
[67] *Ibid.*, 4.
[68] Keith W. Dayton, "Program of the SOREF Symposium: Michael Stein Address on U.S. Middle East Policy," The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Transcript from Federal News Service Washington D.C. Thur May 7, 2009. Accessed 16 Mar 2014.
http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/html/pdf/DaytonKeynote.pdf.

Canada and Operation PROTEUS

The GC's position with regards to the Middle East Peace Process is stated on its website and reads "Canada will support the Middle East Peace Process by defending Israel's right to exist and opposing unilateral actions. The context for peace negotiations will be improved through Canadian assistance to the Palestinians in the security, justice and economic development sectors."[69] The Canadian participation with PA SSR is accomplished in part by its contribution to the USSC called Operation PROTEUS. The Canadian Armed Forces and Royal Canadian Mounted Police personnel of Op PROTEUS provide the PA with training advice and support, helping the PASF develop logistics capabilities, support the reconstruction of security infrastructure and also facilitate cooperation between PA and the GC on issues that are not usually of military interest.[70] The core of Op PROTEUS activities revolve around SFCB at the operational and institutional levels of the PASF. While nominally part of a WOG approach, the Canadian reality is that it is substantially less structured, integrated and resourced than its US and UK partners.

The strategic underpinnings of Canada's participation in PA SSR can be traced from the Defence Diplomacy Global Engagement Strategy issued by The Chief of the Defence Staff. This document elaborates on the process by which GOC priorities as contained in the *Canada First* Defence Strategy (CFDS) among others are translated into defence diplomacy tools that the Canadian Armed Forces can then wield. The line that can be traced from a strategic document like CFDS to the contribution to SSR of the PA

---

[69] Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development, *Report on Plans and Priorities, 2014-2015*, Accessed 27 Mar 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/department-ministere/plans/index.aspx?lang=eng: 18.
[70] National Defense and the Canadian Armed Forces, "Operation PROTEUS," Accessed on 20 Jan 2015. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-current/op-proteus.page.

is tenuous and the fact that funding can be reduced drastically from one year to the next points to periodic policy reviews rather than a long-term strategy in itself.

Both the US and Canada conduct their SSA and SFCB activities within the much wider construct of an SSR program being synchronized under the Office of the Quartet. Based in Jerusalem, this informal diplomatic contact group composed of the United Nations, the European Union, Russia and the US has been a central hub for peace negotiations and the continuing development of the Palestinian territories.[71] Despite failed peace initiatives, the Quartet endures and current PA SSR work done is accomplished under its auspices using the framework of the US sponsored 2003 Performance Based Roadmap Agreement which outlines the PA's and Israeli obligation to work together on improving their levels of coordination and cooperation on matters of security among other items.[72] The SSR environment provided by the Quartet will be discussed further in the next chapter.

SSR player characteristics and interests affect the way in which SSR is delivered. Throughout, it has been shown that national prerogatives must be served by the conduct of SSR. All players participate in it to advance their interests first and foremost and to say that the security of Palestinians writ large is at the forefront of Western and Israeli concerns is not completely accurate. The involvement of the players in the SSR Program does however guarantee a certain legitimacy to the whole process and often times makes up for the fact that funding from one source has dried up or that national policies do not

---

[71] Office of the Quartet representative, "Who we Are," Accessed 7 Apr 2015. http://www.quartetrep.org/quartet/pages/who-we-are.
[72] State of Israel, "A Performance-Based Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict," Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs (30 Apr 2003). Accessed 30 Jan 2015. http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/foreignpolicy/peace/guide/pages/a%20performance-based%20roadmap%20to%20a%20permanent%20two-sta.aspx.

completely support the SSR project. The other important players influencing PA SSR will

be discussed in Chapter 3 – The PA SSR Environment.

*The fight against Hamas cements
our security coordination with
the Israelis.*[73]

 – Senior PASF Official

CHAPTER 3 - THE PA SSR ENVIRONMENT

In early 2015, the political horizon for a permanent status peace agreement seems

very distant. Yet, the West Bank is in a relative state of social and economic peace in

large part due to the security cooperation and coordination between the PASF and Israelis

that the USSC and PA SSR has enabled.   Hope for a better, more secure future can

develop in the youngest generation of Palestinians despite the continued occupation and

lack of progress in the peace process. In this environment, all players involved recognize

the importance of continuing to provide basic security to West Bank residents and the

opportunities that exist due to the absence of open conflict.

Security First, West Bank First Concept

SSR of the PA started in earnest in 2007 with an attempt to bolster this nascent

entity and check the rise of the Islamic Resistance Movement, Hamas following the end

of the Second Intifada. This Intifada unfolded in the early 2000s at the same time that the

US and its coalition partners were involved in the Global War on Terror (GWOT).

Destabilizing Hamas, recognized as a terrorist organization by the US while buttressing

the PA made sense. No nation takes on the responsibility to create and reform another

---

[73] Sr PASF official interview quoted in International Crisis Group, "Squaring the Circle: Palestinian Security Reform Under Occupation," *Middle East Report* no. 98, 7 September 2010: 38.

entity's security sector institutions on purely altruistic motives and there must be a reasonable expectation of a return on investment somewhere in the future. Actively working to find a solution to the Israel-Palestine dispute and removing it as a reason for others to continue on their Islamic Jihad was seen as highly beneficial and would also help the US' long-time ally, Israel. The approach taken by the US when faced with the loss of the Gaza Strip to Hamas and its victory in legislative elections in 2006 was one of Security First, West Bank First.[74] The PA thus became a major recipient of security assistance funding and Lieutenant-General Dayton spoke in 2009 of the impressive stabilizing effect the new PASF immediately had in the West Bank.[75] This was to be expected as the security situation had deteriorated so badly by 2007 that quick win initiatives could be implemented with excellent initial results. Any level of security was preferable to what preceded it but it did not necessarily mean that security institutions would evolve naturally as a result.

According to the OECD (2015), effective (security) institutions are composed of "… robust legal frameworks and representative parliaments with strong capacity for oversight; adept civil services… efficient judiciaries that uphold the rule of law; vibrant and actively engaged civil society; and free and independent media. These institutions depend on the development of decentralised, democratic decision-making processes."[76] Democratic decision making processes that are absent within the PA and which are not being insisted on by SSR donors including the USSC. The OECD further adds that

---

[74] Crouch, *et al*, *Security First: US Priorities…*, 7.
[75] Keith W. Dayton, *Michael Stein Address…*
[76] OECD, "Building More Effective, Accountable, and Inclusive Institutions For All," Element 6 Paper 1. Accessed 11 May 2015. http://www.oecd.org/dac/_POST-2015%20effective%20and%20accountable%20institutions.pdf.

effective institutions play a significant role in promoting citizens' well-being.[77] That these

conditions are not present in the PA security institutions is self-evident given that the

initial thrust of PA SSR was focussed on the Security First, West Bank First concept

designed to counter Hamas and buttress the already authoritarian rule of the PA.

A security first approach is often skewed towards state-centric security to the

detriment of ordinary citizens. The question of what the primary referential object or the

ends of security reforms should be is relevant to this research. Ejdus (2007) asks if the

ends are the individuals that make up the state, the state itself or something outside the

state.[78] For the actors involved in PA SSR, different national conceptions of security, one

grounded in realpolitik and leaning towards a state-centric position, the other following a

human security approach grounded in a concern for the individual citizen whose security

institutions are being reformed creates tension between partners where common

understanding and objectives should be the norm. A flagrant example of this is

represented by asking the question whose interests does SSR of the PA serve? One could

argue the fact that the PA security institutions which are supposed to serve the citizens are

failing to thrive is inconsequential as long as Israeli minimum security needs are met first.

The other view point refers SSR back to its first principles of helping all segments of a

target society rise from the ashes of conflict towards a better future. This is a position

Canada takes in its SSR doctrine but the way it chooses to actually implement reform

measures by funding and in some cases de-funding aid programs to the PA is more aligns

it more closely to the US and Israeli positions. In this environment, any unilateral PA

initiative to raise the stakes in peace negotiations with Israel via attempts to

---

[77] *Ibid.*

[78] Ejdus, *Concept of Security Sector Reform Paper*, 67.

internationalize the dispute at the UN and the International Criminal Court or any successful reconciliation between the PA and Hamas could lead to the whole SSR project termination.[79] Despite this, the value of security coordination between the PA and Israel is widely acknowledged as being extremely valuable. To illustrate this point, the PA often uses the threat of ending security coordination when it wants Israel to move on a particular issue. Further, the very fact that coordination takes place in the manner it does is a fact not often acknowledged by the PA for fear of being branded collaborators or by the GOI to avoid advertising the benefits provided by the PA. At best, this has the effect of pushing valuable and essential SSR work being done to the margins and more subtly, can be actively preventing Palestinian citizens from knowing what the PA is doing on their behalf. Neither of these conditions promotes accountability and transparency and institutional development. Koerner (2006) states that "These views entail far more than the musings of disaffected intellectuals and idealists. They are attempts to come to terms with a reality that is not fully comprehended or accepted. What is certain is that today "security" means coming to terms with forms of domination and insecurities that had long been ignored or sacrificed on the altar of "realpolitik.""[80]

Security is a core issue on which the Israel-Palestine peace depends.[81] The SSR enabled by the USSC is no longer addressing a crisis or emergency situation and is normalizing a day to day routine of occupation and meeting Israel's need for security, what Finkelstein (1998) called "securing the occupation", where Palestinian elites have

[79] Zanotti, *U.S. Security Assistance to…*, 9.
[80] Wolfgang Koerner, "Security Sector Reform: Defence Diplomacy," *In Brief*, Parliamentary Research Service 2006. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/prb0612-e.pdf.
[81] Zanotti, *U.S. Security Assistance to…*, 1.

become used to doing Israel's bidding while enjoying the perquisites of collaboration.[82] One could argue however, that any level of security is good as it ensures a stable and secure space for society to progress and that anything short of the destruction seen in the West Bank during the Second Intifada is an improvement.

According to Hoogensen-Gjørv (2012), security writ large can be understood to have both positive and negative connotations. On one side, negative security means security from (a threat) that one can face while positive security means the security to, an enabling object giving individuals the peace of mind to walk alone at night or be free of the fear of being arrested and detained illegally.[83] The positive security facet of the dual concept advanced by Hoogensen-Gjørv is closely linked to human security in which the object of security is not the state but rather the individual.[84] Current SSR theory sees it as a means to develop institutions that will eventually provide for the entire society of a state, enabling its economy to thrive and perhaps more importantly by allowing better relations with neighbors and potential partners abroad. Canadian military SFCB doctrine states that the focus of SSR should be the "other", the entity whose security institutions need reforming.[85] Israeli and US conceptions of security on the other hand, deal with existential threats to the state and are more oriented towards the former negative security and less human security centered as reforms are initiated to ensure existing and potential trade and security at home are protected while the security of Palestinians becomes an offset goal.

---

[82] Kamrava, *The Modern Middle East…,* 247.
[83] Gunhild Hoogensen-Gjørv, "Security by Any Other Name: Negative Security, Positive Security, and Multi-actor Security Approach," *Review of International Studies* Vol. 38, Issue 4, Oct 2012: 835.
[84] *Ibid.,* 3.
[85] Department of National Defense, *Security Force Capacity Building*, 1-3-5.

To further illustrate this point, Turner (2015) advances that peacebuilding in the Israel-Palestine dispute can also be seen as a form of counterinsurgency (COIN) activity. Like SSR which can be a component activity of peacebuilding, COIN is a stability operation that seeks to unite the efforts of the security, civilian and development domains into one that is population centric.[86] If PA SSR has failed to deliver an independent, viable state Turner opines, it has been very successful in creating an environment where Palestinians are pacified from the inside out by sympathetic local elites.[87] As in COIN, the traditional hearts and minds of the population is still a worthwhile objective to be won but this time it is the Israelis and the US who co-opt the PASF into doing it by policing their own streets and arresting the PA's political opponents. It is not surprising that this is happening in the West Bank. This area has a long history of COIN practices dating back to the British Mandatory period (1920-1948) and of course via the Israeli occupation from 1967 on. Today, training in certain aspects of COIN operations like cordon and search and patrolling that would appear familiar to any NATO military professional are also found in PASF training manuals.[88] The SSR as COIN approach elevates Israeli security needs to the top priority and promotes PA security elites above everyone else. In the end, SSR as COIN maintains the discourse surrounding security above that of long-term development and ensures that a portion of the aid money meant to develop PA institutions and serve the needs of all Palestinians is continually diverted to disrupt the enemy within.

What we are talking about here is security for security' sake where local elites have been funded by foreign donors to carry out security reforms which are more tactical

---

[86] Mandy Turner, "Peacebuilding as Counterinsurgency in the Occupied Palestinian Territory," *Review of International Studies* Vol. 41, Issue 01, (January 2015): 80.

[87] *Ibid*., 88.

[88] Palestinian National Authority, Ministry of the Interior, "Joint Operations Manual," n.p. 2010: 6-7.

and operational in nature while paying lip service to institutional development which is more complex and long-term. Security for Palestinians is an offset goal and this dilutes the process of institutional development as the referent object of security should be the Palestinians themselves, not only their security and government elites and not the state of Israel. This approach to security is also quite inefficient from the donor point of view as Israel is the indirect recipient of aid without foreseeable end as it never has to assume the full security burden for PA administered areas. For the PA in turn, these conditions create a situation where further SSR aid is always required to make up for the fact that their institutions are not enabled.

The Office of the Quartet and the SSR Governance Framework

Financial and development assistance for SSR is but one facet of financial aid to the PA. The USSC delivers its effects under the overarching development framework provided by the Office of the Quartet Representative (OQR). The Quartet is the highest multilateral diplomatic forum for the Israel-Palestine peace process and is composed of the US, the EU, the UN and Russia.[89] The PA and Israel both participate in its decision-making bodies. The development assistance to the Palestinian people funded by the members of the Quartet is administered by the Ad Hoc Liaison Committee (AHLC).[90] As part of a local development forum under the AHCL, the security sector assistance work conducted by the US and Canada among others, makes it on the agenda of the AHLC as part of a sub-sub working group called the Security Sector Working Group (SSWG) co-chaired by the PA Minister of the Interior and a UK representative. Ostensibly, the work

---

[89] Le More, *Killing with Kindness…,* 981.
[90] Local Development Forum, "Ad Hoc Liaison Committee," Accessed 7 Apr 2015. http://www.lacs.ps/article.aspx?id=6.

of the SSWG is to harmonize donor assistance to prevent duplication and ensure security

sector priorities for funding are met.[91] The infrequent convening of the SSWG makes it

difficult to follow-up on its agenda and it tends heavily on being a forum to share

information rather than assigning work. To increase the effectiveness of the SSWG, a

recommendation was prepared by USSC to form functional sub-working groups that

would enable the work of the SSWG and bring in MOI planners and staff to prepare the

SSWG items for discussion, ensuring staffers would actually work on agenda items

between meetings.[92]This approach is typical of trying to operationalize the complex

process of SSR between partners who may not all have the same conception of the

purpose of these meetings and see no value in prior preparation. The whole process is

very cumbersome and time consuming and shows that the smoke and mirrors of meetings

can be advanced as evidence of progress while security and development agencies still

lack a coordinated approach in the field.[93] A system of cooperative committees and

working-groups needs to be used to maximum effect but internal friction is always

present within the inter-agency process and much time and effort gets spent determining

which internal process to use to accomplish the actual work.[94]

 The professionalism and effectiveness of the security sector is not just measured

by the capacity of the security forces, but how well they are managed, monitored and held

accountable.[95] The PA is still trying to develop a workable National Development

---

[91] Office of the Quartet representative, "Who we Are," Accessed 7 Apr 2015.
http://www.quartetrep.org/quartet/pages/who-we-are.
[92] Author's discussion with USSC governance sector planner.
[93] Jackson, *Security Sector Reform and State Building*, 1811.
[94] Zanotti, *The Palestinians: Background…*, 19.
[95] Center for International Governance Innovation, "The Future of Security Sector Reform," ed. Mark Sedra, 2010, Accessed 15 Jan 2015.

Strategy given the instability of donor funding and its overall economic fragility.

Strategy is about the relationship between means and ends and does two things according

to Strachan (2014). It serves 1. To identify the character of the issue at hand and 2.

Reactively manage the issue based on contingencies which appear and also acts to

proactively direct and lead the issue.[96] The PA's National security strategy is also lacking

solid links between its objectives and available resources . As a further example, the

2008-2010 Palestinian Reform and Development Plan was written according to Turner

(2015) by one PA advisor, assisted by a lone UK DFID governance specialist without due

consultation and analysis of what the other PA ministries required.[97] This plan was meant

to discuss the way forward on PA institution building during the inception of Security

First, West Bank First. The author can find no evidence that the plan has been updated

since that time. As a result of this method of producing strategic documents, these plans

are unworkable the instant they are finally distributed and only referred to in passing to

inquisitive Western donors who ask about them. This is a situation that SSR players must

contend with when working with the PASF on elaborating reforms. Their efforts often go

towards strengthening individual services without any tie in to PA strategic direction

which in the end are not grounded in reality.

Consultants and Contractors

The use of consultants and contractors to enable SSR has become commonplace in

all sectors of the PA. This has been the US model for this kind of SSA/SSR work since

the Iraq and Afghanistan campaigns. Whereas military professionals are often available in

---

https://www.cigionline.org/sites/default/files/The%20Future%20of%20Security%20Sector%20Reform.pdf:
16.
[96] Hew Strachan, The Direction of War, Kindle Edition 2014: 221.
[97] Turner, *Peacebuilding as Counterinsurgency…*, 95.

sufficient numbers to conduct SSR work, the kind of specialists that can be used to

develop institutional governance are not present in any great quantity in other government

agencies. In these organizations, the use of contractors becomes prevalent. Contractors

have the attendant disadvantage that they are employees of a private company seeking to

maximize its profits and often, the longer they work the less likely the final effect will be

reached to the desired level.[98] Uniting the work of the various consultants, contractors,

government employees and military specialists is difficult and as a result, everyone ends

up working in silos that do not synch up with each other. Military members use jargon

and planning tools designed for military settings that civilians do not understand perfectly

and conduct SSR of their military counterparts in the PASF using the "like trains like"

approach while the civilian component for the most part uses contractors to deliver the

effect.[99] Given staff limitations, internal friction in deciding which work processes to use,

the USSC is forced to work within and create conditions in an extremely narrow security

sector.

PA and SSR Funding

Zanotti (2015) notes that the West Bank and Gaza Strip are one of the largest per

capita recipients of international aid in the world.[100] Today, funding for SSR is conflated

with all other types of assistance and development aid being provided to the PA. Security

is an aid commodity delivered by donors and in the absence of steady PA Government

revenues; there is no donor exit strategy to speak of. The PA SSR environment is donor

rich but it suffers nonetheless from unstable and variable sources of funding and the

---

[98] Department of National Defense, *Security Force Capability Building*, 4-1-3.
[99] *Ibid.*, 1-4-10.
[100] Zanotti, *US Foreign Aid to…*, 1.

inability to spend money for security priorities that do not meet Israeli approval which is

seldom brought to account for lack of SSR progress. As a result, well-meaning donors

end up facilitating or setting the tone of the occupation in the Palestinian territories with

politically compromised aid.[101] SSR donors tend to develop aid packages that

demonstrate the securitization of aid and many aspects of SSR deal with the hard security

sector to the detriment of other facets like the rule of law, judiciary courts and prisons. On

the flip side, SSR also provides some donor states with a convenient façade for the

continuation of more traditional interest-based security assistance programs, justified

under banners like counter-terrorism or counter-narcotics.[102] This exposes another

approach to security used by western donors in that individual security services that can

be seen to deliver effects quickly are advantaged in the funding process often at the

expense of governance. However, as Zanotti (2010) notes, a certain degree of order has

been re-established in this domain and SSR coordination between donors has been

improved because the US and other donors no longer bypass the PA to deal with their

preferred security organizations as was the case during the tenure of Yasser Arafat.[103] The

economy in the West Bank is mostly driven by government spending and foreign aid. The

outlook for the Palestinian economy will depend largely on political and security

developments and their effect on fostering greater private-sector activity and

investment.[104] Pouring more money into what can be considered a "leaky bucket" will not

---

[101] Le More, *Killing with Kindness…*, 993.
[102] Center for International Governance Innovation, "The Future of Security Sector Reform," ed. Mark Sedra, 2010, Accessed 15 Jan 2015.
https://www.cigionline.org/sites/default/files/The%20Future%20of%20Security%20Sector%20Reform.pdf: 17.
[103] Zanotti, *U.S. Security Assistance to…*, 6.
[104] Palestinian Authority Monitor.

produce benefits for the PA unless Israeli restrictions affecting the free movement of goods and people are lifted.[105]

The Canadian contribution to PA SSR in the form of Operation PROTEUS supports the expenditure of USG and other donors' funds and can be seen as more of a policy response than as part of an overarching Canadian strategy for SSR. The Canadian approach is to work within the guidelines of USSC and to push its own signature projects within the USSC process if they happen to fit the mandate and if Canadian funds are available.

The occupation and the stalled peace process still leave some flexibility for the PA to develop its institutions but if this is to happen, major SSR players like the USSC need to push past their current positions by either promoting or enabling PASF institutions or engage with Israel to obtain some leeway for the PA to develop itself. If it does not do this, USSC will reach a culminating point beyond which it cannot continue to progress and meet USG interests. Facing increasing Israeli opposition or political inertia to a two state solution, the PA will realize that the price of staying in power and pacifying its population is not worth always repressing its opponents internally and ignoring its core interests. If this becomes the case, the USG's neglect of the political reality will create what Lemay-Hébert call the "empty shell" where the conventional approach to state building is in favour of local elites and lacks legitimacy with the wider population.[106] Israel may not want the USSC to be too effective at conducting PA SSR yet the USG will continue to provide leadership in the conduct of SSA for some time to come. This will

---

[105] Global Insights Economic and Country Risks. "International Donors Pledge US$7.4Bil. for Palestinian Authority." Accessed 16 Mar 2014. http://www.ihs.com/products/Global-Insight/industry-economic-report.aspx?ID=106597326: 2/2.

[106] Jackson, *Security Sector Reform and State Building*, 1805.

pose a problem if as an organization, the USSC has lost the cognitive ability to see issues for what they are given the scope of the problem and a limited staff spread across too many functional areas.

In closing the contextual or environmental factors that inform every SSR situation are important. PA SSR is a hybrid because SSR is being conducted by mutual consent of the two main entities (Israel and Palestine) by a third party (the US) who is yet enabled by 4th parties (Canada, UK, Germany, Turkey) simply to set conditions without delivering on the most important desire of the PA, a final and decisive agreement designed to conclude peace between the Israeli and Palestinian people.

Complex peace stability operations need to be evaluated in the right timeframe whether at the end of their mandate and or much longer down the line. Whatever the evaluative criteria one may adopt, the absence of hostilities among the parties to a conflict would certainly seem to be one important measure of success.[107]

– Richard Caplan

CHAPTER 4 – BEST PRACTICES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PA SSR

SSR doctrine calls for building the foundations of the security services and the laws that support them as soon as possible after creating individual security capabilities needed to secure a post-conflict society. In an emergency or to avoid a crisis, SSR players often find themselves in situations where they have no choice but to provide

---

[107] Richard Caplan, "From Collapsing States to Neo-trusteeship: the Limits to Solving the Problem of "Precarious Statehood" in the 21st Century," *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 28, No. 5, 2007: 233.

security first at any cost. SSR is a long term endeavor that can be made even longer and frustrating if actors fail to promote national ownership and ignore the local political realities linked to SSR delivery. These two deadly sins of SSR theory and practice are committed by some if not all of the various SSR players in the Israel-Palestine context. The UN and OECD, normative trend setters in SSR, agree that strengthening national ownership and seeking to understand political realities are ways to ensure an SSR program performs to expectations.[108] Security sector institutional reforms backed by a solid legislative framework and an inclusive political process are also seen as a way to ensure SSR success.

PA security forces were built up quickly with little governance oversight and with an emphasis on the hard security sector. Today, it is agreed that the referent object of security should be the individuals making up a society and not only entitled elites or an outside power like Israel. Wolff (2011) further states that choosing the right set of institutions can effectively provide a link between security that provides a coercive capacity to one that provides security that derives from the rule of law for the benefit of citizens is all important.[109] In an ideal situation, thorough assessments prior to beginning SSR work or even at mid-mandate can help map institutions and local stakeholders, identify capacity strengths and gaps and prioritize entry points and opportunities for re-investment of SSR resources and activities.

---

[108] OECD, "Security Sector Reform: What Have We Learned?" 2009, Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/conflictandfragility/docs/44391867.pdf: 4.
[109] Wolff, *Post-Conflict State Building: the Debate…*, 1780.

National Ownership

National ownership of reforms is often cited as a desirable condition for any entity undergoing such a process and is essential to institution building. The components of national or local ownership can include among other things, a political class that looks past current conditions and problems with an eye to making long-term, sustainable decisions. In the PA SSR context, civil society involvement with its ability to add to an open debate on security, propose changes and criticize the national authority and its security forces without fear of being coerced needs to be included as a component of national ownership. Given the level of donor involvement, ownership has to include an analysis of the impacts due to loss of donor funding. Finally, SSR actors must remember that while desirable, national ownership should by definition include an exit strategy or point where the host nation takes over funding from the donor. Care must be taken, however to avoid saddling the PA with too much responsibility too quickly.[110]

Strategic communications can be an enabler of national ownership. These messages convey high level intent regarding concepts and processes and satisfy long term strategic goals of an organization.[111] In 2011, Lieutenant-General Kurt Moeller, the third US Coordinator spoke to the effect that USSC was about to embark on the second phase of its campaign plan which was to focus on building the capacity of PASF institutions instead of train and equip activities. [112] In late 2014, the situation was that many senior PASF leaders still did not acknowledge that they should be looking towards building up

---

[110] Albrecht Schnabel and Hans Born, "Security Sector Reform: Narrowing the Gap Between Theory and Practice," The Geneva Center for Democratic Control of the Armed Forces, 2011: 49.

[111] Wikipedia, "Strategic Communication," Accessed 10 May 2015. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Strategic_Communication.

[112] Kurt Moeller, "Statement for House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia." July 12, 2011. Accessed 16 Mar 2014. http://archives.republicans.foreignaffairs.house.gov/112/moe071211.pdf

the central institutions of the MOI and the PA as a whole instead of defending the status quo in their own services. The PA also has to communicate strategic messages internally to its own personnel involved in cross-cutting SSR work. For example, it must develop and distribute its own national security sector strategy and it must be workable and be resourced properly, clearly linking ends, ways and means with existing funding and how priorities will be impacted if funding is reduced. It should not simply be as Jackson (2011) notes of many developing world planning documents, "a wish list" for donors to grant."[113]

The cultural component linked to societal attitudes, limitations and expectations must also be considered as enabling national ownership.[114] Attempts to re-model or even invent the ethos of the PASF into something that it is not needs to be avoided.[115] Current efforts which may not represent due attention to cultural attitudes and expectations include the development of a Palestinian Officer Academy and discussions surrounding SSR actors' perceived need for enlisted service members' leadership development that conform to Western ideals for security forces. These initiatives are met with a reasonable degree of initial buy-in by the PASF but their implementation has been problematic as Western desires often exceed PASF willingness to design and build these institutions themselves. It would be extremely useful to determine to what extent the PASF are willing to self-develop and self-organize without foreign SSR actor involvement and this should be part of any re-assessment of the PA SSR program.

---

[113] Jackson, *Security Sector Reform and State Building*, 1817.
[114] Department of National Defence, *Security Force Capability Building*, 1-2-1.
[115] *Ibid.*, 2-1-3.

Political Realities - PA Factionalism, Occupation, Security First

Local political realities matter in the Palestine-Israel dispute. The origins and

formation of the PASF need to be understood in the correct context. They are currently

beholden to the PA President and this centralization of power needs to be reduced by

acting on the Palestinian Basic Laws that already exist to fill senior security force

positions of authority including the Minister of the Interior. Once created, these positions

with their institutional mandates, backed up by laws can harness the energies and

resources of the individual services and produce governance changes to improve the

conduct of PA affairs and deliver better security to Palestinians.

The case of PA security reforms is made more difficult by its particular situation

with regards to Israel and the presence of this powerful actor in all aspects of PA SSR.

SSR players and donors must continue to work with Israel to improve security

coordination between the two entities but must also recognize that there is a moral cost to

this because as Klein states. "Israel's regime is based on maintaining the superiority of

the Jewish ethnic group through among other things, security measures taken against the

Palestinians."[116] The situation in the West Bank has improved dramatically since USSC

started working with the PA but the case of Israel creates a dilemma for donors who want

to support Palestinians and also indirectly end up bankrolling Israeli policies towards the

occupied territories. In general, SSR players acting on behalf of national interests and

required to stay on message with regards to policy should study and understand the

---

[116] Klein, *Is the Arab Spring Israel's Winter?*, 31.

situation from all angles in order to remain as neutral as possible but also have knowledge of what is excluded from the SSR process and why it matters.[117]

Israeli involvement and oversight in PA SSR is problematic and circumvents the intuitive expectations that any reform work is accomplished in support of and to the ultimate benefit of the PA. Israeli involvement is an insurmountable fact that must be managed and tested to determine where its limits lie. PA SSR funded with donor funds is a bargain for Israel, in 2015, the amounts provided for PA SSR alone is $70M USD and the amounts are not even included in the total USG assistance funding to the Jewish state.[118] Part of the mandate of SSR players including USSC and Canada should be to inject tension into the system to keep it moving forward and challenge assumptions and paradigms like security first, West Bank First in the face of the stalled peace process. This is necessary in order to avoid that donor commitment and pledges for further SSR funding is not an open ended proposition without an exit strategy.

The future may bring about conditions that cannot be envisioned now and SSR practioners need to be able to take a long view in which for example, a two-state solution is no longer the working paradigm or one where PA reconciliation with Hamas or a peace deal with Israel develops. One hopes that the lessons learned and the insights gained by the current SSR actors will be transferred to follow-on teams of SSR practitioners.

Building Bridges

A role of the USSC is to help all parties involved coordinate with each other by building trust among the entities. Israel as a highly developed, first world, sovereign state but is nevertheless a vital actor in a high stakes dispute with the Palestinians. Since the

---

[117] Jackson, *Security Sector Reform and State Building*, 1817.
[118] Zanotti, *The Palestinians: Background…*, 1.

quality of security provided via SSR of the PA is so important to Israelis, It must become a reflex of SSR practitioners to encourage Israel to take the first steps in as many SSR initiatives as possible. A potential additional avenue to explore would be to engage with what Barak and Sheffer (2006) call the informal yet very potent Israeli "security network" consisting of serving and retired senior military personnel and civilian individuals from all spheres of Israeli society involved in security. Contact with this group could produce insights on emerging trends that are likely to affect SSR of the PA and Israel in the near future.[119] As described in Chapter 3, Palestinians are under military occupation in the West Bank. COGAT is a key authority that needs to vet any reform initiative being proposed and is likely in a position to propose valuable initiatives that SSR players and the PA have not conceived of yet. The reality in Israel is that relatively weak coalition government leaves the military in a position to be involved in the political process more than in most western states. As security professionals themselves, they can become advocates for longer-term security reforms and have the ability to design and implement them on the ground.[120] USSC needs to engage them at every opportunity to keep issues of PA SSR at the forefront.

Strategic Coherence Between SSR Actors

Strategic alignment and coherence of the SSR program requires a common referent object for reforms and a comprehensive understanding of local context, actors and priorities.[121] SSR in general and that of the PA specifically, needs to move beyond the technical-administrative aspects of building up security forces to secure Israelis and

---

[119] Peri, *The Political-Military Complex…*, 339.
[120] *Ibid.*, 330.
[121] OECD, "OECD DAC Handbook on Security Sector Reform: Supporting Security and Justice," 2007. Accessed 6 May 2015. http://www.oecd.org/: 43.

counter Hamas into a people-centered process, designed to address issues of institutional governance and legitimacy. SSR actors should encourage the PA to move away from regime security and coup-proofing, characteristic of the narrow security sector towards the individual Palestinian citizen as the referent object for security. Such an approach, addressing the root causes of insecurity in the Palestinian territories could also help current SSR players move out of their current rut. To paraphrase Anderson (2014), a human security referent object would provide a national "planet" (USG or GOC Strategies for SSR) around which policy (USG-SSA) and doctrinal (GoC-SFCB) "moons" could orbit."[122] Before this can take place however, the complex processes that characterize the interagency environment of PA SSR will need to be acknowledged as a source of friction.[123] Clear mandates and higher direction, a common doctrinal basis for SSR language and processes like project management and performance measurement can all help. The OECD (2007) recommends a process of "joined-up reporting to enhance co-ordination and help move agendas from the field and at headquarters in the same direction."[124] This will be beneficial only insofar as it is backed up by a process for knowledge management to assist all SSR players' access this common information and knowledge. The USSC in particular but also the national contingents from Canada, the UK, Germany and Turkey that support specific aspects of SSR need to avoid reinventing the wheel and align themselves with the normative guidelines set forth by their own governments which are often informed by organizations like the UN and the OECD.

Best Practices from SSR Normative Organizations.

---

[122] Anderson, *Changing the Game…*, 23.

[123] Zanotti, *US Foreign Aid to…*, 2.

[124] OECD, "OECD DAC Handbook on Security Sector Reform: Supporting Security and Justice," 2007. Accessed 6 May 2015. http://www.oecd.org/ : 240.

The UN's SSR: Way Forward document (2013) stresses the need for reform

actors' long term commitment to SSR as part of post-conflict and reconciliation

environments.[125] This is especially applicable in the case of a transitional entity like the

PA. The UN also recommends mainstreaming gender and human rights into any SSR

approach as part of a greater people-centered approach, reinforcing the human security

concept discussed in Chapter 3.[126] The PASF have progressed with inducting women into

the security services and Palestinian society overall benefits from being more egalitarian

than other countries in the Middle East. The PA simply cannot ignore the vast stores of

talent and potential that reside in its female population and must do all it can to include

them in their institutions. The security services have acknowledged the requirement to

ensure that the needs of women and girls are included in SSR but the laws and resources

are simply not there yet.[127] The gender consideration and its integration into PA

institutions is not directly related to Western concepts of security but it is related to the

primacy of the hard security sector as a whole at the expense of individual security and

safety issues for women and women's organizations as part of civil society. The PASF

have given due consideration to integrating the rule of law, the proper use of force and

mainstreaming human rights for its members and this being taught to new members at the

Jordanian International Police Training Center in Amman, Jordan.[128] Training in these

aspects constitutes a minimum requirement according to the UN but again it does not

---

[125] United Nations, "The United Nations and Security Sector Reform: The Way Forward." *Report prepared by the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces on behalf of the Slovak Republic*. 5-6 Mar 2013: xx.

[126] *Ibid.*

[127] Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, *Palestinian Women and Security: Why Palestinian Women and Girls Do Not Feel Secure*, 2010. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.peacewomen.org/assets/file/Resources/NGO/wps_palestwomensecurity_dcaf_2010.pdf.

[128] Zanotti, *U.S. Security Assistance to…*, 15.

necessarily follow that this approach will yield greater respect for these concepts as individuals assume positions of greater responsibilities within their organizations.[129]

The UN also stresses the importance of having a comprehensive, multi-layered approach to SSR. While trying to work collaboratively with the PA on several issues, the USSC and its international partners must avoid surprising the PA with plans or initiatives they should have participated in from the beginning.[130] Integrating the PA early ensures that there is national ownership and ensures that the capability or project that is proposed does not go beyond the ability of the PA to absorb and more importantly sustain, given their precarious finances. Finally, the UN promotes the value and recognizes the emerging trend of South-South or horizontal donor support which in the PA context could be enabled by greater participation from the Kingdom of Jordan in PASF training and institution building efforts.

In general, Western donors and SSR practitioners are not attuned to the cultural norms of the society they are trying to build the capacities for.[131] Generally, given the lack of overall national framework combined with a true WOG approach, military staff specialists do not have the adequate levels of training and relevant experience to be employed in SRR work. This lack of training and preparation forces them into what Varhola (2014) calls reductionist approaches and incorrect paradigms.[132] For example, the

---

[129] United Nations, "The United Nations and Security Sector Reform: The Way Forward." *Report prepared by the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces on behalf of the Slovak Republic*. 5-6 Mar 2013: 12.

[130] Department of National Defence, *Security Force Capability Building*, 3-4-14.

[131] Taliaferro, et al, "Foreign Culture and its Effect on US Department of Defense Efforts to Train and Advise Foreign Security Forces," *Small Wars Journal* online, 26 Nov 2014, Accessed 2 Feb 2015. http://smallwarsjournal.com/print/17964.

[132] Christopher Varhola, "Foreigners in a Foreign Land: Complexity and Reductionist Approaches in Stability Operations," *Small Wars Journal* online, 5 Nov 2014, Accessed 10 Feb 2015. http://smallwarsjournal.com/print/17137.

trend in counter-terrorism of the mid to late 2000s was at the heart of the creation of

Palestinian security services to deal with Hamas and other terror organizations during that

period. The initial PASF plan initiated by Lieutenant-General Dayton was built on a

structure of some 2700 PG and 5500 NSF troopers and this satisfied the requirements to

secure the West Bank. PA pension laws, human resource processes within the PA public

service and a proliferation of PASF organizations and committees have not caught up and

as a result, eight years later, the actual numbers and continued effectiveness and

contribution to West Bank security of this original contingent is in question. This is an

example of what can happen if the operational capabilities of specific organizations are

built up without due regard for oversight and institutional governance but also an

indication today that the scope of the problems can no longer be ignored.

Finally, the UN (2013) adds that an emerging trend is to focus on the nexus

between SSR (as a system) and development rather than simply security and

development.[133] This approach recognizes that SSR includes more than the hard security

aspects and goes into the need for building up civil society and touches on the issue of

violence against women, good governance and poverty which all apply to the PA. It is not

the job of SSR to deliver the whole package but a balance must be reached. There is a

need to recognize that SSR has become a type of assistance aid and in turn, SSR actors

must have a comprehension or working level understanding of key documents, best

practices and guidelines such as the OECD-DAC's Paris Declaration on Aid

Effectiveness which applies the five aid effectiveness principles: 1) Ownership; 2)

---

[133] United Nations, "The United Nations and Security Sector Reform: The Way Forward." *Report prepared by the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces on behalf of the Slovak Republic*. 5-6 Mar 2013: 12.

Alignment; 3) Harmonization; 4) Management for Results; and, 5) Mutual Accountability.[134] Simply put, the imperatives of military style planning, structure, effectiveness and efficiency are no longer what the PA needs to develop its institutions.

Improving the Canadian Contribution to PA SSR

The Canadian contribution to PA SSR is now ten years old and has delivered infrastructure and equipment projects, training and planning expertise as well as other intangible benefits linked to our continued presence in the Middle East and involvement in the MEPP. The value of a top down and bottom up re-assessment of the Canadian SSR contribution to include a truly WOG approach, based on a coherent linkage to national strategy and firmly rooted in sector reforms that the PA is willing and able to adopt is the only way to deliver enduring effects that are firmly in pursuit of common objectives and brings true security to Palestinians in their communities. In effect, the whole process needs to be more about them and less about Canada, or Israel, to deliver long lasting benefits even if the peace is not concluded in the near future.

There is a continued need for Canadian involvement in PA SSR. While GOC SSR guidelines exist, there is a disconnect between policies and implementation on the ground leading to an ad hoc approach to delivering Canadian SSR effects. The GOC West Bank and Gaza Strategy (2009) refers to a WOG approach but cites "This approach is not based on formal structures, but successfully relies on a high degree of cooperation among Canadian government departments and agencies at both the working and official levels at headquarters and in the field."[135] While it can be said today that there is excellent

---

[134] OECD, "Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness," 2005, Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/34428351.pdf.

communication and networking between the various Canadian actors working with the

PA and PASF, this is not necessarily true for communication and policy implementation

between a series of headquarters in Canada and the field. Variable and currently absent

development funding is also an indication of this disconnect. In one of its lessons learned

document, DCAF describes Canada's Stabilization and Reconstruction (START) Task

Force as an enabler of Canadian SSR efforts.[136] While the Canadian contribution to the

USSC continues uninterrupted since 2005 with the provision of specialist staff officers to

that organization, the primary means to expend pure Canadian SSR aid via START

funding seems to have disappeared, likely a victim of limited budgets and changing GOC

priorities. The GOC website lists past START fund SSR related success stories but none

beyond the year 2012.[137] Granted, these infrastructure projects are continuing to deliver

benefits to the PASF but current absence of funding limits Canadian involvement at a

time where building up PA institutions is crucial for continued progress. The first best

practice and recommendation for improvement is to provide training for those individual

actors who will be tasked to deliver the components of an SSR program. SFCB draft

doctrine states that understanding the operational environment and how to deliver SFCB

in an SSR framework is critical.[138] Yet there is very little training provided to the WOG

team in their duties. SSR resources exist to make preparation and integration into an SSR

---

[135] Canadian International Development Agency, "West Bank and Gaza Strategy," 2009. Accessed 10 May 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/development-developpement/assets/pdfs/countries-pays/West-Bank-and-Gaza-Country-Strategy-2009.pdf.

[136] Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces, *SSR in a Nutshell: Manual for Introductory Training on Security Sector Reform*, the International Security Sector Reform Advisory Team, 2012: 21.

[137] Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development Canada, "Supporting Greater Prosperity and Security for Palestinians," Accessed. 12 May 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/media/aff/news-communiques/2013/06/17a.aspx?lang=eng.

[138] Department of National Defence, *Security Force Capability Building*, 1-4-5.

context easier. Individuals thus trained will understand where they fit in the organization and bring to bear their judgment, experience and critical thinking ability on the actual issues that matter and not peripheral issues that do not contribute to SSR program performance.

CONCLUSION

Security Sector reform of the PA is only a means to an end. It cannot be a strategy in itself and it is unlikely that a political solution will appear into the breathing space created by USSC unless Israel and the PA come to terms with the basic facts of their dispute. The concepts and methods used to create strong services like the PG and NSF have in many ways hindered their further development and institutionalization into fully accountable and transparent organizations beholden to the Palestinian people. To begin to remedy this situation, the security sector reform of the Palestinian Authority delivered by Western donors is in urgent need of a re-assessment in order to determine new approaches to move past the current stalled environment. Without forcing the two state solution on any party, PA factionalism and lack of legitimacy and the practical facts of the military occupation of the West Bank need to be addressed as part of this holistic re-assessment. Overall, the Western donor and Israeli oriented Security First-West Bank First approach has given expected results and ensured security for the citizens of Israel. It is now time to move away from security as counter terrorism and PA regime security tool towards better security for the individual living in his/her community in the occupied territories.

Finally, an internal re-ordering of USSC tasks must be completed with a view to prioritize the development of security forces governance and institution building. The Canadian contribution to PA SSR must also be re-assessed to embed cleanly within this

new USSC construct. A truly WOG approach must be made real, backed up by the

required SSR training, personnel and resources including a stable line of funding for SSR

work. This will be key to delivering lasting effects for the PA and Palestinian

communities in the West Bank in future years.

Bibliography

Agha, Hussein and Khalidi, Hussein, S. *A Framework for Palestinian National Security Doctrine*. London: Royal Institute of International Affairs, 2006.

Andersen, Louise Riis. "Security Sector Reform and the Dilemmas of Liberal Peacebuilding." *Danish Institute of International Studies Working Paper* 2011. 31. 2011.

Anderson, John C. "Changing the Game: Human Security as Grand Strategy." U.S. Army War College Press, Carlyle Barracks, PA: 2014.

Amrov, Sabrien and Tartir, Alaa. "Subcontracting Repression in the West Bank and Gaza." *The New York Times* online 26 November 2014. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/27/opinion/subcontracting-repression-in-the-west-bank-and-gaza.html?_r=0.

Ball, Nicole. "The Evolution of the Security Sector Reform Agenda." In *The Future of Security Sector Reform*. Ed. Mark Sedra. Center for International Governance Innovation. 2010, Accessed 15 Jan 2015. https://www.cigionline.org/sites/default/files/The%20Future%20of%20Security%20Sector%20Reform.pdf.

Ball, Nicole. "Evaluation of the Conflict Prevention Pools: The Security Sector Reform Strategy." March 2004. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.oecd.org/derec/unitedkingdom/35096612.pdf.

Barak, Oren and Sheffer, Gabriel. "Israel's Security Network and Its Impact: An Exploration of a New Approach." *International Journal of Middle East Studies* vol. 38, 2006.

Barak, Oren, "Studying Middle East Militaries: Where do We Go from Here?" *International Journal of Middle East Studies* vol. 43, 2011.

Barari, Hassan. "Jordan's Role in Israeli-Palestinian Peacemaking." In *Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace*, edited by David Pollock, 25-28. Washington Institute for Near-East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus90.pdf.

Canada, Canadian International Development Agency. "West Bank and Gaza Strategy." 2009, Accessed 10 May 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/development-developpement/assets/pdfs/countries-pays/West-Bank-and-Gaza-Country-Strategy-2009.pdf.

Canada, Department of National Defence. CFJP 01, *Canadian Military Doctrine Manual*. Ottawa:DND Canada 2011.

Canada. Department of National Defence. B-GL-323-000/FP-001 Draft, *Security Force Capacity Building*. Ottawa:DND Canada, 2014.

Canada. Department of National Defence. "Operation PROTEUS." Accessed on 20 Jan 2015. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/operations-abroad-current/op-proteus.page.

Canada, Department of National Defence. "Backgrounder: The Canada – U.S. Defence Relationship." Accessed 17 Feb 2015. http://www.forces.gc.ca/en/news/article.page?doc=the-canada-u-s-defence-relationship.

Canada. Department of Defense and the Canadian Armed Forces. "*Canada First* Defence Strategy." 2008. Accessed 13 Feb 2015. http://www.forces.gc.ca/assets/FORCES_Internet/docs/en/about/CFDS-SDCD-eng.pdf.

Canada, Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development. *Report on Plans and Priorities, 2014-2015*. Accessed 27 Mar 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/department-ministere/plans/index.aspx?lang=eng.

Canada, Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development. "Supporting Greater Prosperity and Security for Palestinians." Accessed. 12 May 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/media/aff/news-communiques/2013/06/17a.aspx?lang=eng.

Canada, Department of Foreign Affairs, Trade and Development. "Security System Reform."Accessed 6 May 2015. http://www.international.gc.ca/start-gtsr/ssr-rss.aspx?lang=eng.

Caplan, Richard. "From Collapsing States to Neo-trusteeship: the Limits to Solving the Problem of "Precarious Statehood" in the 21st Century." *Third World Quarterly* vol. 28 no. 5, 2007.

Center for Security Governance. *SSR Country Snapshot: Palestinian Territories*. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.ssrresourcecentre.org/countries/country-profile-palestinian-territories/.

Crouch, J.D., Meigs, Montgomery C., Slocombe, Walter B. "Security First: US Priorities in Israeli-Palestinian Peacemaking." Washington Institute for Near East Policy Report. 2008.

Dayton, Keith W. "Program of the SOREF Symposium: Michael Stein Address on U.S. Middle East Policy." The Washington Institute for Near East Policy, Transcript from Federal News Service Washington D.C. May 7, 2009. Accessed 16 Mar 2014. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/html/pdf/DaytonKeynote.pdf.

Ejdus, Filip. "Concept of Security Sector Reform Paper." Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.bezbednost.org/upload/document/(5)_ejdus.pdf.

Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces. *SSR in a Nutshell: Manual for Introductory Training on Security Sector Reform*. The International Security Sector Reform Advisory Team, 2012.

Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces. *Palestinian Women and Security: Why Palestinian Women and Girls Do Not Feel Secure*. 2010. Accessed on 20 Jan 2015. http://www.peacewomen.org/assets/file/Resources/NGO/wps_palestwomensecurity_dcaf_2010.pdf.

Gill, M. "Polling Palestinians." Survey Research. 9-14 September 2014.

Global Insight Economic and Country Risks. "International Donors Pledge US$7.4Bil. for Palestinian Authority." Accessed 16 Mar 2014. http://www.ihs.com/products/Global-Insight/industry-economic-report.aspx?ID=106597326.

Global Insight. "Country Intelligence Report: Palestinian Authority 2013." Accessed 16 Mar 2014.

Hoogensen-Gjørv, Gunhild. "Security by Any Other Name: Negative Security, Positive Security, and Multi-actor Security Approach." *Review of International Studies* vol. 38 issue 4, (Oct 2012): 835-859.

International Crisis Group. "Squaring the Circle: Palestinian Security Reform Under Occupation." *Middle East Report* no. 98, 7 September 2010.

Jackson, Paul. "Security Sector Reform and State Building." *Third World Quarterly* vol. 32 no. 10, 2011.

Kamrava, Mehran. *The Modern Middle East: A Political History Since the First World War*. 2nd ed., Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.

Khalili, Laleh. "The Location of Palestine in Global Counterinsurgencies.*" International Journal of Middle East Studies* 42 (2010):413-433.

Klein, Menachem. "Is the Arab Spring Israel's Winter?" *Palestine-Israel Journal* vol. 18 no. 1, 2013.

Koerner, Wolfgang. "Security Sector Reform: Defence Diplomacy." In-Brief Parliamentary Research Service 2006. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/LOP/ResearchPublications/prb0612-e.pdf.

Kupperwasser, Yosef. "The Problem is Palestinian Rejectionism." *Foreign Affairs* vol 90 issue 6, Nov/Dec 2011.

Le More, Anne. "Killing with Kindness: Funding the Demise of the Palestinian State." *International Affairs* vol 81 no. 5, 2005.

Lewis, Samuel. "Israeli-Palestinian Breakdown Scenarios." In *Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace*, edited by David Pollock, 6-10. Washington Institute for Near-East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus90.pdf.

Local Development Forum. "Ad Hoc Liaison Committee." Accessed on 7 Apr 2015. http://www.lacs.ps/article.aspx?id=6.

Marquette, Heather and Beswick, Danielle. Introduction, "State Building, Security and Development: State Building as a New Development Paradigm." *Third World Quarterly* vol 32 no.10, 2011.

Meharg, Sarah and Arnusch, Aleisha. "Security Sector Reform: A Case Study Approach to Transition and Capacity Building." PKSOI Paper January 2010. Accessed on 20 Jan 2015. http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=960.

Moeller, K. "Statement for House Committee on Foreign Affairs, Subcommittee on the Middle East and South Asia." July 12, 2011. Accessed 16 Mar 2014. http://archives.republicans.foreignaffairs.house.gov/112/moe071211.pdf.

OECD. "Security Sector Reform: What Have We Learned?" 2009. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.oecd.org/dac/governance-peace/conflictandfragility/docs/44391867.pdf.

OECD. "Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness." 2005. Accessed 20 Jan 2015. http://www.oecd.org/development/effectiveness/34428351.pdf.

OECD. "Building More Effective, Accountable, and Inclusive Institutions For All." Element 6 Paper 1. Accessed 11 May 2015. http://www.oecd.org/dac/_POST-2015%20effective%20and%20accountable%20institutions.pdf.

OECD. "OECD DAC Handbook on Security Sector Reform: Supporting Security and Justice." 2007. Accessed 6 May 2015. http://www.oecd.org/.

Office of the Quartet Representative. "Who we Are." Accessed on 7 Apr 2015. http://www.quartetrep.org/quartet/pages/who-we-are.

Palestinian Authority Monitor Reference.

Palestinian National Authority, Ministry of the Interior. *Joint Operations Manual*. n.p. 2010.

Palestinian National Authority. *Security Sector Strategic Plan 2014-2016 Draft*. April 2014.

PASSIA. "PLO v.s. PA." Information Pamphlet, September 2014.

Patir, Yael. "Who is Afraid of Peace?" *Palestine Israel Journal*, vol.18 no. 4, 2013.

Peri, Yoram. "The Political-Military Complex: The IDF's Influence Over Policy Towards the Palestinians Since 1987."*Israel Affairs*, vol 11 No 2, 2005.

Pollock, David. Ed., "Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace." Washington Institute for Near-East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus90.pdf.

Rubin, Aviad. "Political-Elite Formation and Transition to Democracy in Pre-state Conditions: Comparing Israel and the Palestinian Authority." *Government and Opposition* vol. 44 no. 3, 2009. 262-284.

Rubin, Barry. "Setting US Policy Towards Hamas." in *Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace*. edited by. David Pollock, 19-24, Washington Institute for Near-East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus90.pdf.

Sayigh, Yezid. "Agencies of Coercion: Armies and Internal Security Forces." *International Journal of Middle East Studies*. vol. 43. 2011.

Sayigh, Yezid. "Inducing a Failed State in Palestine." *Survival* vol 49 no 3. 2007.

Schnabel, Albrecht and Born, Hans. "Security Sector Reform: Narrowing the Gap Between Theory and Practice." The Geneva Center for Democratic Control of the Armed Forces, 2011.

Sicherman, Harvey. "Playing for the Breaks." In *Prevent Breakdown, Prepare for Breakthrough: How President Obama Can Promote Israeli-Palestinian Peace*, edited by David Pollock, 10-12. Washington Institute for Near-East Policy, Policy Focus #90, Dec 2008. Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/pubs/PolicyFocus90.pdf.

State of Israel. "A Performance-Based Roadmap to a Permanent Two-State Solution to the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict." Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs (30 Apr 2003). Accessed 30 Jan 2015.

http://www.mfa.gov.il/mfa/foreignpolicy/peace/guide/pages/a%20performance-based%20roadmap%20to%20a%20permanent%20two-sta.aspx.

State of Israel, Israeli Defense Force, "The Security Situation in Judea, Samaria & Israel." Slide presentation, 2015.

Strachan, Hew. "The Direction of War." Kindle edition. 2014.

Taliaferro, Aaron, Hinkle, Wade P., and Gallo, Alexander O. "Foreign Culture and its Effect on US Department of Defense Efforts to Train and Advise Foreign Security Forces." *Small Wars Journal* online, 26 Nov 2014. Accessed 2 Feb 2015. http://smallwarsjournal.com/print/17964.

Turner, Mandy. "Peacebuilding as Counterinsurgency in the Occupied Palestinian Territory." *Review of International Studies* vol. 41 issue 01. (Jan 2015): 73-98.

United Nations. "The United Nations and Security Sector Reform: The Way Forward." *Report prepared by the Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces on behalf of the Slovak Republic*. 5-6 Mar 2013.

United Nations. "Security Sector Reform: Definitions." Accessed 4 Apr 2015. http://unssr.unlb.org/SSR/Definitions.aspx.

United Nations. "Second Secretary-General's Report on SSR (A/67/970–S/2013/480)." Accessed 4 Apr 2015. http://unssr.unlb.org/Resources/UNDocuments/tabid/255/currentpage/1/Default.aspx.

United States. Department of Defense. FM 3-07.1, *Security Force Assistance*. May 2009.

United States. Department of Defense. *Joint Doctrine Note 1-13: Security Force Assistance*. 29 April 2013.

United States. Department of State. "Enduring Leadership in a Dynamic World: Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review 2015." Accessed, 4 May 2015. http://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1870/QDDR2015.pdf.

United States. Department of State. "United States Security Coordinator for Israel and the Palestinian Authority (USSC)." Accessed on 15 January 2015. http://www.state.gov/s/ussc/.

United States. Office of the Inspector General. *Performance Evaluation of Palestinian Authority Security Forces Infrastructure Construction Projects in the West Bank*. Report Number MERO-I-11-03. March 2011.

United States. United States Security Coordinator, "West Bank: Palestinian Security Forces, A Guide." Internal document. 2008.

Varhola, Christopher. "Foreigners in a Foreign Land: Complexity and Reductionist Approaches in Stability Operations." *Small Wars Journal* Online, 5 Nov 2014. Accessed 10 Feb 2015. http://smallwarsjournal.com/print/17137.

Washington Institute for Near East Policy. "Palestinian Polling Report June 2014." Accessed 15 Jan 2015. http://www.washingtoninstitute.org/uploads/Documents/other/PalestinianPollingReport_June2014.pdf.

Wolff, Stefn. "Post-Conflict State Building: the Debate on Institutional Choice." *Third World Quarterly*, vol. 32 no. 10, 2011.

Yossef, Amr. "Israel and Post-Mubarak Egypt: Perils of Historical Analogy." *Digest of Middle-East Studies*, vol 21 no 1, (2012): 49-62.

Zanotti, Jim. "U.S. Security Assistance to the Palestinian Authority." Congressional Research Service Report for Congress 7-5700, R40664, 2009.

Zanotti, Jim. "The Palestinians: Background and U.S. Relations." Congressional Research Service Report for Congress 7-5700, RL34074, 2015.

Zanotti, Jim. "US Foreign Aid to the Palestinians." Congressional Research Service Report for Congress 7-5700, RS22967, 2014.

Zoli, Corri and Armstrong, Nicholas J. "Post 9/11 Stability Operations: How US Army Doctrine is Shaping National Security Strategy." *PRISM*, vol. 2 no.1 (December 2010): 101-120.